

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

Form Approved
OMB No. 0704-0188

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302, and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0704-0188), Washington, DC 20503.

1. AGENCY USE ONLY (Leave blank)

2. REPORT DATE

20 Sep 95

3. REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERED

4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE

A Multidimensional Approach To Distinguishing Between The Most and Least Politically Engaged Senior Citizens, Using Socialization And Participation Variables

5. FUNDING NUMBERS

6. AUTHOR(S)

Anne Daugherty Miles

7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)

AFIT Students Attending:

Georgetown University

8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER

95-086

9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
AFIT/CI
2950 P STREET, BLDG 125
WRIGHT-PATTERSON AFB OH 45433-7765

10. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER

11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES

12a. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

Approved for Public Release IAW AFR 190-1
Distribution Unlimited
BRIAN D. GAUTHIER, MSgt, USAF
Chief of Administration

12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE

13. ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 words)

Accession For

NTIS CRA&I ☒
DTIC TAB ☐
Unannounced ☐
Justification

By
Distribution /

Availability Codes

Dist Avail and/or
Special

19951019 129

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 5

14. SUBJECT TERMS

15. NUMBER OF PAGES

350

16. PRICE CODE

17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT

18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE

19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT

20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING SF 298

The Report Documentation Page (RDP) is used in announcing and cataloging reports. It is important that this information be consistent with the rest of the report, particularly the cover and title page. Instructions for filling in each block of the form follow. It is important to *stay within the lines* to meet *optical scanning requirements*.

Block 1. Agency Use Only (Leave blank).

Block 2. Report Date. Full publication date including day, month, and year, if available (e.g. 1 Jan 88). Must cite at least the year.

Block 3. Type of Report and Dates Covered. State whether report is interim, final, etc. If applicable, enter inclusive report dates (e.g. 10 Jun 87 - 30 Jun 88).

Block 4. Title and Subtitle. A title is taken from the part of the report that provides the most meaningful and complete information. When a report is prepared in more than one volume, repeat the primary title, add volume number, and include subtitle for the specific volume. On classified documents enter the title classification in parentheses.

Block 5. Funding Numbers. To include contract and grant numbers; may include program element number(s), project number(s), task number(s), and work unit number(s). Use the following labels:

C - Contract	PR - Project
G - Grant	TA - Task
PE - Program Element	WU - Work Unit Accession No.

Block 6. Author(s). Name(s) of person(s) responsible for writing the report, performing the research, or credited with the content of the report. If editor or compiler, this should follow the name(s).

Block 7. Performing Organization Name(s) and Address(es). Self-explanatory.

Block 8. Performing Organization Report Number. Enter the unique alphanumeric report number(s) assigned by the organization performing the report.

Block 9. Sponsoring/Monitoring Agency Name(s) and Address(es). Self-explanatory.

Block 10. Sponsoring/Monitoring Agency Report Number. (If known)

Block 11. Supplementary Notes. Enter information not included elsewhere such as: Prepared in cooperation with...; Trans. of...; To be published in.... When a report is revised, include a statement whether the new report supersedes or supplements the older report.

Block 12a. Distribution/Availability Statement. Denotes public availability or limitations. Cite any availability to the public. Enter additional limitations or special markings in all capitals (e.g. NOFORN, REL, ITAR).

DOD - See DoDD 5230.24, "Distribution Statements on Technical Documents."

DOE - See authorities.

NASA - See Handbook NHB 2200.2.

NTIS - Leave blank.

Block 12b. Distribution Code.

DOD - Leave blank.

DOE - Enter DOE distribution categories from the Standard Distribution for Unclassified Scientific and Technical Reports.

NASA - Leave blank.

NTIS - Leave blank.

Block 13. Abstract. Include a brief (*Maximum 200 words*) factual summary of the most significant information contained in the report.

Block 14. Subject Terms. Keywords or phrases identifying major subjects in the report.

Block 15. Number of Pages. Enter the total number of pages.

Block 16. Price Code. Enter appropriate price code (*NTIS only*).

Blocks 17. - 19. Security Classifications. Self-explanatory. Enter U.S. Security Classification in accordance with U.S. Security Regulations (i.e., UNCLASSIFIED). If form contains classified information, stamp classification on the top and bottom of the page.

Block 20. Limitation of Abstract. This block must be completed to assign a limitation to the abstract. Enter either UL (unlimited) or SAR (same as report). An entry in this block is necessary if the abstract is to be limited. If blank, the abstract is assumed to be unlimited.

Diana M. Owen
James P. Fogle
William T. Gumbly

August 29, 1995
Date

.....
For the Dean

A MULTIDIMENSIONAL APPROACH TO DISTINGUISHING BETWEEN
THE MOST AND LEAST POLITICALLY ENGAGED SENIOR CITIZENS,
USING SOCIALIZATION AND PARTICIPATION VARIABLES

A Dissertation
submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate School of Georgetown University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the
degree of
Doctor of Philosophy in American Government

By

Anne Daugherty Miles, B.A., M.A.

Washington D.C.
August 29, 1995

Copyright by Anne Daugherty Miles 1995

All rights reserved

ABSTRACT

Title: A Multidimensional Approach to Distinguishing Between the Most and Least Politically Engaged Senior Citizens Using Socialization and Participation Variables

Name: Anne Daugherty Miles

Mentor: Diana Owen, PhD, Georgetown University

This study is based upon a paradox: while large numbers of seniors enjoy sufficient personal resources to become highly politically engaged *if they choose to*, few of these potential activists do more than vote. This study tests the impact of a wide assortment of variables to better understand why this is so. Variables include the "usual suspects" from political participation literature (i.e. partisanship) and more unusual suspects drawn from socialization, prosocial behavior, and political communication research. Data, collected by the author, is based on 319 completed surveys from three subsamples of seniors: 120 suburban, 99 small town, 100 Gray Panthers.

The term "*political engagement*" encompasses three distinct dimensions of participation -- voting, activity beyond voting, and attention to politics. Findings suggesting that important predictors vary by dimension support this decision.

Findings also suggest that continuity explains much of the paradox. Seniors maintain levels of activity established much earlier. Change tends to be in the direction of *increased* activity as long as those activities are *passive*. Factoring continuity into participation models greatly enhances their explanatory power.

Findings support the life cycle theory of political socialization. The best socialization predictors are variables associated with parent-child communication, political role modeling, paternal power, and the area in which the individual was raised. Their predictive power varies by dimension.

Beyond the impact of engagement dimension variables, the best predictors by dimension are as follows: group variables and internal efficacy in the activity dimension, interest and health in the attention dimension, and years in the community and socialization variables in the voting dimension.

In comparison with their peers, Panthers are unique. Some of the more unexpected findings include those associated with their high level of education, lack of religiosity, moderate income, and early, stressful, parent-child relationships.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The completion of this dissertation would not have been possible without the support and contributions of many individuals. I am most indebted to my mentor, Dr. Diana **Owen**, whose suggestions and encouragement helped me through many difficult periods. I also thank the other members of my committee, Dr. William **Gormley** and Dr. James **Lengle** for their advice and support.

Special thanks to the following: Abe **Bloom**, Convener, Montgomery County Network; Selma **Bonham**, Gray Panther; Cliff **Carlstedt**, Convener, Gray Panthers of Sarasota, FL.; Jo **Fife**, community activist; Viola **Fisher**, AARP member; Dixie **Horning**, Executive Director, National Organization of Gray Panthers; Mary **Jenkins**, community activist; Germaine **Lipscomb**, former Panther; Janet **Parker**, Co-Convener, Prince George's County Network; Esther **Webb**, Co-Convener, Prince George's County Network; and Ethel **Weisser**, Convener, Washington D.C. Network.

The AARP library was an invaluable resource, particularly during the initial stages of my literature review. Many thanks to all the staff there for their assistance.

Finally, I thank the members of my immediate family (**Dick**, **Jessica**, **Kevin** and **Laura**), my parents (particularly my mother, the proofreader), and my friends (especially **Johanna**) for their suggestions, encouragement, patience, and love.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	iii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	v
LIST OF FIGURES.....	ix

CHAPTERS:

1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
Defining Political Engagement.....	3
Research Questions.....	12
The Study.....	17
2. SOCIALIZATION LITERATURE.....	21
Defining Political Socialization.....	22
The Chaffee Typology.....	30
The Altruistic Personality.....	35
The Baumrind Typology.....	38
Change Versus Continuity.....	44
Political Socialization Theories.....	50
Psychosocial Theories.....	54
Hypotheses.....	62
3. POLITICAL ENGAGEMENT LITERATURE.....	66
Political Participation Literature.....	67
Political Communication Literature.....	69
The Voting Activity Dimension.....	87
The Political Activity Dimension.....	101
The Political Attention Dimension.....	109
Hypotheses.....	115
4. METHODS AND MEASURES.....	117
Fundamental Questions.....	118
Variable Measurement.....	128
Data Collection.....	140
Data Analysis.....	144
Comparing ANES and Study Samples.....	145

5. FINDINGS: CONTINUITY VERSUS CHANGE.....	159
Political Activity.....	162
Political Attention.....	163
Voting Activity.....	164
Political Interest.....	165
Measuring Change.....	166
Hypotheses: Expected Versus Observed.....	169
6. FINDINGS: CHILDHOOD SOCIALIZATION VARIABLES.....	172
Potentially Important Predictors.....	173
Chaffee Typology Findings.....	178
Baumrind Typology Findings.....	184
Hypotheses: Expected Versus Observed.....	194
7. FINDINGS: POLITICAL ENGAGEMENT VARIABLES.....	201
Section I: The Political Activity Dimension.....	203
Section IA: The Panther Factor.....	208
Section II: The Political Attention Dimension.....	220
Section III: The Voting Activity Dimension.....	226
Hypotheses: Expected Versus Observed.....	231
8. PREDICTING DIMENSIONS OF POLITICAL ENGAGEMENT.....	236
Model 1: Regression with the Usual Suspects.....	239
Model 2: Adding Childhood Socialization Variables....	243
Model 3: Using Pre-60 Dimension Variables.....	246
Model 4: Using Post-60 Dimension Variables.....	249
Best Predictive Model for Political Activity.....	249
Best Predictive Model for Political Attention.....	250
Best Predictive Model for Voting Activity.....	250
Model 5: Adding Core Pre-60 Dimension Variables.....	252
9. SUMMARY, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	258
Continuity Versus Change.....	262
Childhood Socialization Variables.....	265
Political Engagement Variables.....	271
The Political Activity Dimension.....	273
The Political Attention Dimension.....	274
The Voting Activity Dimension.....	275
The Gray Panthers.....	277
Concluding Comments.....	278

APPENDICES:

A. STUDY SURVEY.....	280
B. VARIABLE LIST.....	291
C. CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS FOR STUDY VARIABLES.....	302
Table I: Correlation Coefficients for Subsamples.....	302
Table II: Correlation Coefficients for Dimensions	307
D. CONTINGENCY TABLES.....	312
Section I: Study Samples Versus 1992 ANES Sample.....	314
Section II: COUNTY3 by Independent Variables.....	321
Section III: POLACT2 by Independent Variables.....	324
Section IV: POLATTN2 by Independent Variables.....	327
Section V: VOTE2 by Independent Variables.....	330
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	334

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE:	PAGE
2.1 CHAFFEE'S FAMILY COMMUNICATION PATTERN TYPOLOGY.....	31
3.1 PERCENTAGES FOR AGE BY EDUCATION BY VOTER PARTICIPATION IN 1992 (ANES DATA).....	92
3.2 HYPOTHESES BASED ON POLITICAL ENGAGEMENT LITERATURE....	115
4.1 MISSING DATA IN STUDY BY SUBSAMPLE.....	158
5.1 CONTINUITY VERSUS CHANGE: A MACRO VIEW.....	161
5.2 PRE-60 BY POST-60 POLITICAL ACTIVITY.....	162
5.3 PRE-60 BY POST-60 POLITICAL ATTENTION.....	163
5.4 PRE-60 BY POST-60 VOTING ACTIVITY.....	164
5.5 PRE-60 BY POST-60 POLITICAL INTEREST.....	165
5.6 CONTINUITY VERSUS CHANGE: A MICRO VIEW.....	168
6.1 THE CHAFFEE TYPOLOGY AND SAMPLE RESULTS.....	181
6.2 THE BAUMRIND TYPOLOGY AND STUDY VARIABLES.....	186
6.3 CLUSTER ANALYSIS USING THE BAUMRIND TYPOLOGY.....	188
6.4 POSITIVE OR NEGATIVE CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS AND SOCIALIZATION VARIABLES.....	190
7.1 TESTING OUR HYPOTHESES: EXPECTED VS OBSERVED.....	232
PREDICTING DIMENSIONS OF POLITICAL ENGAGEMENT USING:	
8.1 STANDARD PARTICIPATION VARIABLES.....	243
8.2 PARTICIPATION AND CHILDHOOD SOCIALIZATION VARIABLES....	246
8.3 PARTICIPATION, CHILDHOOD AND PRE-60 VARIABLES.....	248
8.4 PARTICIPATION, CHILDHOOD AND POST-60 VARIABLES.....	251
8.5 ALL VARIABLES.....	253

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

"There is only one solution if old age is not to be an absurd parody of our former life, and that is to go on pursuing ends that give our existence a meaning -- devotion to individuals, to groups or to causes, social, political, intellectual or creative work. In spite of the moralists' opinion to the contrary, in old age we should wish still to have passions strong enough to prevent us turning in upon ourselves. One's life has value so long as one attributes value to the life of others, by means of love, friendship, indignation, compassion. When this is so, then there are still valid reasons for activity or speech" (de Beauvoir, 1970, 601).

The American population is steadily aging, yet the United States is still dominated by a youth culture. Political Science is not unlike the rest of America; there seems to be more interest in the politicization of "Generation X" than in the politicization of our senior citizens. This study marks an attempt to rectify the situation by focusing on the political engagement of senior citizens. Specifically, we are interested in which characteristics are the most important in distinguishing between the most engaged seniors and the least and whether the political engagement of seniors reflects a lifetime of commitment or a new found outlet to (in the words of de Beauvoir) "give our existence meaning."

While participation studies form the basis for this study, this work is unique because it looks beyond the "usual suspects" found in the participation literature and draws variables from

socialization, prosocial behavior, and political communication research. That is not to say that looking beyond the usual is new in itself. An eclectic (or "multidimensional," as it is sometimes known) approach is common to studies in the 1990s. Political scientists are increasingly drawn to variables outside the more standard variables of the past. The participation literature's "usual suspects" such as political efficacy, partisanship, civic duty, interest and education are not being discarded but new variables in other fields and other disciplines are being added as political scientists become more adept at handling the increasingly more sophisticated measuring techniques and statistics available to researchers. The value of the "tried and true" participation variables has long been recognized but the amount of variation they can explain in participation is not very great. As studies in the 1970s and 1980s increasingly recommended that other factors needed to be explored, more and more researchers began pushing the boundaries of what were acceptable variables to include. Steven Peterson, author of *Political Behavior* (1990), suggests that a more eclectic approach has become the norm and reflects what we call a more "whole person" (our term, not his) or inclusive approach than that used in the past. Standard participation variables of the past concentrate on the political while more current studies are increasingly turning to the sociological and psychological. Thus, one of the unique aspects of this study is not its

eclectic approach but rather the attention to a broad range of variables derived from political socialization, prosocial, and political communication research. In addition, its dual focus on both socialization variables from an individual's past, and simultaneous attention to participation variables in an individual's present, is another unique feature of this study.

Yet another aspect of this study which sets it apart from other participation research is the way in which it stretches the meaning of political participation to include another dimension -- political attention. While references to this passive aspect of participation exist in the literature, they are rare (see Conway, for example, 1991). Because of this perspective on participation, we prefer to use the term political "engagement." Research referenced as "participation literature" seldom takes this more inclusive approach. Therefore, before going further, we need to explain more about the distinction between participation as it is usually defined and "political engagement" as it is used in this study.

Political Participation or Political Engagement?

Most researchers in the area of political participation offer definitions similar to Rosenstone and Hansen's definition of political participation: "action directed explicitly toward influencing the distribution of social goods and social values" (1993, 4). (See Milbrath and Goel, 1977, 2, for example.)

However, an expanded definition which incorporates activities such as following politics through the mass media seems particularly appropriate to use in regards to seniors. Theoretically, attending to politics should be attractive to seniors because they often have more free time than younger citizens combined with less physical energy and/or mobility, and heightened concern over issues such as Social Security or Medicare. For example, we know that television viewership generally increases with age. People over 55 watch an average of 39 hours per week (Ansolabehere, 1993, 11). Passive activities might also reflect how deeply an individual feels the desire to keep informed about politics.

As tempting as it might be to include these passive activities in a definition of participation, many would argue that the word participation excludes this. Webster's definition for participate is "to have or to take a share with others (in some activity)." The implication seems to be taking an *active* part in an activity. Verba and Nie, for example, made a conscious effort to ignore any political behavior that was not "active." Milbrath (*Political Participation*, 1965) differentiated between active and passive postures toward politics but dismissed passive activities as simply behavior that included obeying laws and paying taxes. While active political behavior could be graded into quantities from total inactivity to holding public office, activities such as watching, listening, or

reading about politics were ignored (1965, 18). And most recently, Brady, Verba and Schlozman (1995) also chose to ignore any political behavior that is not "active." Therefore, if we want to expand our sense of political participation to include passive activities, it may make more sense to think in terms of **political engagement** and define it to mean: **those activities of citizens by which they seek to better understand, influence or support government and politics.**

As such, we are interested in a variety of political activities, ranging from activities requiring little energy such as watching, reading, and listening to politics to activities requiring a great deal of energy such as attending rallies, working in elections, and protesting. It was actually a preliminary factor analysis conducted (by the author) on the first 100 surveys that brought these three dimensions to light - an attention dimension, a voting dimension and an activity dimension.¹ Although this study's distinction between three separate dimensions is also unique, it does not remove it from participation studies.

Why Study Seniors?

Since 1900, the number of Americans 65 years and over has increased from one in 25, to one in eight as of 1986 (U.S. Senate 1988). Today, there are 33 million Americans over 65, but that number will increase to 70 million by 2030, reports Spencer Rich in the Washington Post (Health Insert, 25 April 1995, 7). Retirement and leisure in old age are relatively recent phenomena -- a staple of old age only since the early part of this century. The dramatic increase in people considered "senior" is shifting government priorities, increasing Congressional interest in the "gray lobby," and causing concern in baby boomers about the future ability of the federal government to cushion the retirement years of today's middle aged citizens.

Using 1990 as a base, Hewitt and Howe (1988) identify the "swing generation," people born between 1900-1926, the "silent generation" of people born in the 1930s, and the baby-boom generation born after WWII between 1946-64. The swing generation will be the largest group of elderly over the next twenty years. Their ages of greatest socialization occurred during the 1930s and 1940s. Their members came to accept and support an activist government during the New Deal and are now the greatest advocates for federal entitlement programs such as Social Security and Medicare. The silent generation, born in the 1930s or early 1940s, enjoyed the affluent period of the

1950s-1980s. They are changing the definition of being old from being poor and needy to being well-off and productive (Torres-Gil, 1992, 13-5). Bernice Neugarten calls this group the "young-old" or "well-derly" (1986, 35). Their longevity, and that of succeeding generations, means that more elders living longer have the potential to be politically active as senior citizens whether or not they have been so during their working years.

Morris and Bass go so far as to say that this trend is producing a new "class" in American society -- those of the nonworking elderly who are blessed with both comfortable incomes and good health (1991, 95). This "class" of seniors is redefining when senior status begins. The evidence suggests that retirement begins *before* age 65, at age 62 or earlier, and is voluntary (Atchley, 1976; Barfield and Morgan, 1978; Foner and Schwab, 1983; Parnes, 1981; Sammartino, 1987; Schultz, 1985). According to Morris and Bass, the proportion of Social Security beneficiaries who retire at or before age 65 has grown from one in six in 1950 to roughly 89 percent in 1981. For most Americans, the period between ages *sixty and eighty* is one of relatively good health (1991, 94). Thus, Neugarten and Neugarten (1986) argue that the old distinctions between life periods are blurring: "The social reality [is] that the line between middle age and old age is no longer clear" (1986, 35).

*However, for the purposes of this study, senior status begins at age sixty.*²

Morris and Bass ask us to consider the implications for this new "class" of "well-derly" seniors -- people experiencing the transition to a more healthy, able and economically independent old age (1991, 96). In response to this type of question, Torres-Gil (*The New Aging*, 1992) writes, "The last 60 years represent a new form of generational politics in American history. Based on interest groups, the system has exhibited a phenomenon never before seen -- the organization of people considered old around issues for their age group... Its activism has led to a vast system of services and benefits at all levels of government with largely age-based eligibility criteria.... The benefits and services established led to a dramatic reduction in poverty among the elderly and the empowerment of older voters... The sheer number of older people demonstrating their new-found identity led to a new political force in the U.S. The increased health, activism and productivity of older people gave positive meaning to being old" (65).

Many worry that in a political system where sophistication, high voting rates, direct mail, money, and access influence decisions, senior citizen lobbies such as the American Association of Retired Persons (AARP), the National Council of Senior Citizens (NCSC), the National Committee to Preserve Social Security and Medicare (NCPSSM) and grass-root groups will

exercise too much power. This worry is expressed in articles such as: "Is There A Gray Peril?" (Rosenbaum and Button, 1989); "Seeing Gray: School Bond Issues and the Aging in Florida," (Button and Rosenbaum, 1989); and "Saying No to Grandma," (Wagar, 1989). (See also Hudson, 1978; Samuelson, 1981; and Longman 1985.)³

These worries were reinforced by the repeal of the Medicare Catastrophic Coverage Act (MCCA) in 1989 and the budget debates of the early 1990s when senior citizen groups fought major cutbacks in Social Security and won. The effectiveness of these groups has been largely attributed to their ability to "get out the vote" (Pierce and Chaharis, 1982; Pampel and Williamson, 1989). The MCCA of 1988 was the first time a piece of major legislation was enacted and repealed within a year due to political pressure (Torres-Gil, 1992, 80).

In response to these concerns (raised most vocally by a new group called Americans for Generational Equity (AGE) -- formed to counter what they perceive as older people benefitting at the expense of younger age groups) senior groups are increasingly engaged in activities designed to promote intergenerational equity and cooperation. Generations United, for example, is a new coalition of groups representing both children and the elderly.

Groups like the Gray Panthers help to defuse much of the anxiety stirred by AGE spokesmen. For these groups the primary

rheterical cause has always been intergenerational cooperation (Day, 1990, 35). Specifically, Panthers define themselves as anyone who "either alone, or with others, actively promotes the interaction of young and old people and the maximum involvement of all ages in areas of social and political life" (Barrow and Smith, 1979, 363).

The power demonstrated in cases such as the MCCA has largely been the power of the polls. While interest groups such as AARP and NCSC give the impression of a rising tide of senior political activity because they represent thousands of members, in reality, their major attraction is material incentives, as opposed to purposive incentives. In a 1982 AARP membership survey cited by Paul Light (1985, 77) about the advantages of joining AARP, most mentioned the publications; the discounts on insurance, drugs, and health aids; and the travel club and investment opportunities. Only 17 percent said they joined primarily because AARP "cared about and helped the elderly." AARP is not alone in offering such incentives. All senior groups do except the Gray Panthers, whose leaders emphasize political commitment over size, and whose members are not offered material incentives beyond their monthly newsletter (Day, 1990, 66). As one senior told us, "I count on AARP to represent my interests so I don't have to do anything other than vote."

The Reality

The reality, then, is that although senior citizens vote at a higher rate than those in other age groups, and have the opportunity to be more politically engaged than simply voting, few of these potentially skilled, committed workers actually do more than vote (Verba and Nie, 1972; Torres-Gil, 1992). As their numbers increase in the electorate, efforts to mobilize them on behalf of candidates and a variety of issues will undoubtedly increase. Whether or not such appeals will be effective depends upon many factors, one of which must certainly be the *relationship between change and senior citizens*. Can we expect seniors to change habits built over a lifetime? If the answer is yes, can we expect that change to be in the direction of more involvement instead of less?

Generally speaking, do senior citizens tend to participate beyond voting if they have not been politically active throughout their adult years? If the answer is yes, then political leaders have an ever increasing pool of potential activists to galvanize. They simply need to persuade seniors that a particular person or cause needs their active intervention. If the answer is no, then political leaders have two options. First, focus on interest groups, such as AARP, in the hope that the information they provide their members will promote votes favorable to their cause. Second, pay more attention to younger audiences in an effort to establish

political activity early enough so that it continues into their senior years.

Research Questions

The first question that this study addresses then, is the following: ***Can we characterize the political engagement of seniors as one of change or continuity over the life course?***

For most seniors, does one's level of political engagement reflect the continuation of a level of political engagement maintained throughout one's adult years, or does their level of political engagement change after they turn sixty? The second question flows from the first: ***If we see change, is it in the direction of more or less involvement?***

Beyond the question of whether seniors over sixty became engaged early or late, why did they do so when so many are not politically engaged beyond voting? While researchers generally conclude that, "it is usually difficult (if not impossible) to assess the motives underlying actions (Eisenberg, 1989, 4)," both logic and political science literature can point to a plethora of factors which influence participation, from education and personality to years in the community. Few participation studies, however, have been interested in the connection between childhood experiences and the political participation of senior citizens. Since research questions one and two (concerning continuity versus change over the life span) place this

study primarily within the adult political socialization literature, to address the question of predisposition or potential for future political activity, we turn to childhood socialization literature and ask a third research question: ***How do the childhood socialization experiences of highly politically engaged seniors compare with the childhood socialization experiences of less politically engaged seniors?***

In the words of political scientist Roberta Sigel, socialization is an "interactive phenomenon." By this she means the process by which we are trained to "fit" into our social environment is affected by both the individual's own development and the societal demands s/he has to cope with (Sigel, 1989, 458). Sociologists assume that behavior is best explained as a result of an interaction between personal and external social, or *situational*, factors. Personal factors include personality, character and values; situational factors refer to the immediate external environmental conditions over which a person has no control but nonetheless affects behavior (Oliner and Oliner, 1988, 10).

Situational factors include not only demographic variables such as one's gender, ethnic identity, or social class, but also various "agents" of socialization including the family, schools, peers, and mass media. Considerable debate exists over which socialization agent is most important to the socialization process. Hyman (1959), the "father" of political socialization

research, concluded: of these agents, family is the strongest, especially in the lower classes; the socialization process begins early in life and ends by late adolescence (46). Stanley Renshon argues, "what children learn early in life within the family context are basic beliefs about the nature of the world" (1974, 64). Renshon pays considerable attention to family dynamics, particularly the family authority structure, in an effort to determine whether a relationship exists between a child's feelings of interpersonal and personal control and the amount of autonomy and authority the child enjoyed within the family setting. Renshon concludes, "parental personality traits are important components of the political socialization experience. Indeed, for both personal control and interpersonal trust beliefs, they are the most influential" (78).

Support for the importance of family in the socialization process abounds in the literature. Proponents argue that parents have the most opportunity to influence their children's future behavior because of the "unique physical and emotional dependency of the child" (Davies, 1965). Throughout a child's formative years, parents can transmit ideas and values, model participation, conformity, and so on. (See Hess and Torney, 1965; Pinner, 1965; Greenstein, 1969; Dennis, 1969.) Furthermore, structural constraints in the family, such as those suggested by Chaffee et al. (1973), have the capacity to indirectly shape a child's political development.

Recent studies suggest that the power of the family to influence children is declining due to factors such as the changing structure and cohesiveness of the family, and the simultaneous rise of mass communication (Atkin, 1981; Owen and Dennis, 1987, 1988, 1992). However, today's senior citizens are products of a much more family centered era. It seems reasonable to assume that the early socialization findings of Hyman, Greenstein, Dennis, and others which overwhelmingly supported the dominance of the family apply to today's seniors. Thus, the focus of this question will be on the parents of the senior citizens under investigation.

And finally, the fourth research question addressed in the study is the one we began this chapter with: ***Which of the characteristics we are studying are the most important in distinguishing between the most engaged and the least?***

The research questions direct our attention to the sub-fields of political socialization and political participation. A brief review of relevant literature within these fields (in Chapters Two and Three) helps to place this study within the context of current research and gives us a theoretical basis for the assumptions and hypotheses presented in regard to the four questions.

Predicting Participation

As we will see, based on the literature review in Chapters Two and Three, several hypotheses emerge. The specifics of hypotheses three and four will be discussed in the appropriate chapters.

H1. Continuity characterizes political engagement -- levels of political activity before and after sixty remain fairly constant. Thus, the greater the political engagement before sixty, the greater the political engagement after sixty.

H2. Within a sample of seniors, for those who show change instead of continuity: voting will continue to increase with age, active forms of engagement will decline after age sixty, passive forms of engagement will increase after age sixty.

H3. Childhood determinants of "prosocial" behavior are related to childhood determinants of political behavior. Some parental behaviors increase the potential for political activity as a senior citizen, other behaviors decrease the potential for political behavior as a senior citizen. (See Chapter Two.)

H4. Social/demographic and political variables (such as age, free time, group involvement, residence, efficacy, ideology, and previously high levels of political engagement) increase, others decrease (trust), and still others result in no change (such as health, income, and sex) in the potential for political engagement as a senior citizen. (See Chapter Three.)

The Study

Although the literature currently available is helpful, little hard data exists to answer our four research questions beyond theoretical speculation. Participation studies tend to use large samples drawn from all age groups and usually find that important predictive variables include characteristics that vary enormously in the general population (such as income, education, time and health). Finding distinguishing characteristics is more difficult when the population is smaller and more homogeneous (i.e., all senior, retired, fairly healthy, well-educated and financially independent). However, for several reasons, conducting research on a small, fairly homogeneous group is precisely what this study sets out to do. First, such a study is more feasible for one person to do. Second, we are interested in distinguishing between seniors who, on the surface (based on demographic profiles), *should all* be active in politics but because of other, more subtle, characteristics still vary enormously in their levels of political engagement.

The desire to study continuity versus change in political engagement levels over time, coupled with the desire to improve our ability to predict different dimensions of senior citizen political participation using socialization variables, drives the methodology chosen for this study. Chapter Four addresses the methodology in great detail, outlining a variety of important questions that needed to be addressed before the field

research could begin. These questions include: (1) *Where will the data come from?* (2) *How reliable are the memories of senior citizens?* (3) *What survey instrument is best suited to the goals of this study?* (4) *How closely can we approximate a representative, random sample, of seniors?* (5) *How should we design the questionnaire?* and (6) *Can one measure change over time without a longitudinal study?*

The survey was administered to three groups (subsamples) of seniors: those residing in suburban Arlington County, Virginia; those residing in rural St. Mary's County, Maryland; and senior members of the Gray Panthers residing throughout the Washington Metropolitan area. The goal was approximately 300 seniors (100 from each group) providing a full spectrum of political engagement levels. The end result was 319 completed surveys: 120 Arlington County residents, 99 St. Mary's County residents and 100 members of the Gray Panthers.

Findings

Chapters Five through Eight are data chapters containing the study findings. Chapter Five concentrates on research questions one and two which address continuity versus change. Chapter Six concentrates on research question three and discusses findings in terms of socialization variables. Chapter Seven concentrates on participation variables. Chapter Eight is concerned with research question four -- determining the best

predictors of political engagement using the variables identified in Chapters Five through Seven. And finally, Chapter Nine attempts to summarize the data, draw some conclusions, and make recommendations. We turn in the next chapter to our review of socialization literature.

Chapter One Notes

1. The term "political engagement" was coined to encompass all three dimensions of political engagement. The study, as originally planned, first attempted to build a political activity construct using several types of participation variables. Analysis using a construct comprised of variables from all three dimensions resulted in meaningless data. It became apparent that there were three distinct dimensions of political participation within the construct, one of which could be termed "political activity."

2. Although many scholars prefer to define the elderly as those over 65 (for example, Siegel and Taeuber, 1986, 79) we were persuaded otherwise. Arguments presented by Neugarten, Morris and Bass, and others suggest a younger cut-off is more realistic. Age 60 was suggested by seniors themselves in a pretest. The first pretest used "before and after age 55" questions. Seniors felt 55 was too young, 65 too old. Too many were still working or taking care of family at 55.

3. This worry is also evident in the May 1995 Senate hearings into the finances of the AARP chaired by Senator Alan Simpson (R-WY). See the Washington Post article "AARP's Nonprofit Status Comes Under Scrutiny," 22 May 95, pp A1 and A8, for details on the AARP "Empire."

CHAPTER 2: SOCIALIZATION LITERATURE

While the overall focus of this dissertation is on the political participation of seniors, this chapter argues that many socialization variables potentially offer important clues which may help to explain why some seniors participate while others do not. This argument is not a new one; as early as 1959, Herbert Hyman wrote, "political behavior is complex and many different aspects could be examined as outgrowths of socialization" (26). He lamented that, "*attention given to politics as a consequence of socialization is almost completely lacking*" (26). While the work of Hyman prompted a great deal of research on political socialization during the 1960s and 1970s, that research was confined almost exclusively to children and adolescents and attempted to predict their future political behavior. Since those early days the field of political socialization has largely stagnated due in large part to the difficulty in studying the behavior and measuring the attitudes of children, especially small ones.

Current efforts in this field tend to focus on adult socialization. For one reason, adults are easier to study, and for another, this aspect of socialization was ignored until the late 1970s. Until that time the predominant socialization paradigm dictated that the socializing process was largely over

once individuals finished adolescence. Once the credibility of the "persistence model" began to erode, and researchers observed that attitudes and behaviors often changed after individuals became adults, the field of adult socialization took off.

The variables chosen for this study borrow from research done in both areas -- childhood socialization and adult socialization. In reference to research question three (*which concerns comparing the childhood socialization experiences of seniors*) we turn to the childhood socialization literature and focus almost exclusively on the parent-child relationship for reasons to be discussed shortly. In reference to research questions one and two (*Are levels of political engagement characterized by change or continuity, and if we see change, is it more or less?*), we turn to adult socialization literature and focus on studies which address change versus continuity over time. Before going further, however, we need to clarify exactly what we mean by political socialization.

Political Socialization

The field of socialization encompasses the disciplines of political science, sociology and psychology. It became a popular field of study in the 1960s, largely in response to a book by the same name published by Herbert Hyman in 1959. A trained sociologist, Hyman brought a set of assumptions concerning the relationship between the individual and society

from that discipline to the new subfield of political science he helped to create. Specifically, his belief that society inculcated political values in its citizens to perpetuate itself was reflected in the following definition of political socialization: *the transition from generation to generation of the ethos of a political system by the conscious and unconscious instilling of the values of a particular culture (7).*

Research concerning childhood socialization has been dominated by the debate over which agent (family, school, peers, media) is most important to the socialization process. In order to narrow the focus of this study to manageable proportions, we had to consider each argument in the debate and take a position. In our opinion, at least in terms of the seniors in this study, the family was chosen as the most important agent of socialization largely because of the fact that today's seniors were socialized during a much more family centered era than more recent generational cohorts.

CHILDHOOD SOCIALIZATION

Proponents of the "family as dominant agent" argument are predominantly, but by no means exclusively, researchers who conducted their studies in the 1950s and 1960s. Hyman summed up the position of this group when he concluded: of these agents, family is the strongest, especially in the lower classes; the socialization process begins early in life and ends by late adolescence (1959, 46). Stanley Renshon adds, "what children learn early in life within the family context are basic beliefs about the nature of the world" (1974, 64). Renshon pays considerable attention to family dynamics, particularly the family authority structure. He concludes, "parental personality traits are important components of the political socialization experience. Indeed, for both personal control and interpersonal trust beliefs, they are the most influential" (78).

Proponents argue that parents have the most opportunity to influence their children's future behavior because of the "unique physical and emotional dependency of the child" (Davies, 1965). Throughout a child's formative years, parents can transmit ideas and values, model such behaviors as participation and conformity. (See Hess and Torney, 1965; Pinner, 1965; Greenstein, 1974; Dennis, 1973.) Furthermore, structural constraints in the family, such as the family communication

patterns suggested by Chaffee et al. (1973), have the capacity to indirectly shape a child's political development.

Many studies, including a now classic work by Jennings and Niemi, cast doubt on the dominant role of the family. Their findings, published in *Generations and Politics* (1981), focused on both adolescents and their parents and revealed that moderate to strong correlations between parents and children were the exception rather than rule. Families did not transmit as many values and opinions to their children as expected. They found a general decline in agreement over the panel period, a dramatic drop in agreement levels for partisanship and candidate preference, and the highest correlations for nonpolitical matters such as beliefs about the Bible and church attendance. The authors conclude that "life cycle effects, the role of other socializing agents and attitude instabilities, help account for the very noticeable departures from the model positing high transmission" (347).

Almond and Verba, Hess and Torney, Langton and Jennings, and others, stress the role of the school in the formation of political attitudes. A number of studies have focused on the objectives, content and impact of government or civics courses at the High School level. [See, for example, Litt, 1963; Schick and Somit, 1963; Robinson et al., 1966.] Others have concentrated on the liberalizing impact of a college education, such as the Newcomb study discussed later in this chapter. While it

is apparent that curriculum, teachers, school climate and peers contribute to the process of political socialization, the relative contribution of each is unclear. Study findings have produced controversial and inconsistent results (Dennis, 1973, 366).

Research by Hess and Easton (1962) and Hess and Torney (1967) while arguing that the school is the primary socializing agent, present data that may suggest otherwise. In a nationwide study of children, Hess and Torney tested the degree of political learning and experience that had occurred at the elementary school level. They found significant correlation between the attitudes and knowledge levels of the children and what was taught in their schools. However, it seems equally possible that the attitudes and behaviors encouraged by teachers at the elementary school level simply mirrored attitudes and behaviors encouraged by parents.

Recent studies suggest that the power of the family to influence children is declining due to factors such as the changing structure and cohesiveness of the family, and the simultaneous rise of mass communication -- primarily television (Atkin, 1981; Owen and Dennis, 1987, 1988, 1992). However, today's senior citizens are products of a much more family centered era that did not include television as part of the preadult socialization process.

Consequently, due to both the contradictory evidence against the family model and the family-centered nature of the early twentieth century, *it seems reasonable to assume that the early socialization findings of Hyman, Greenstein, Dennis, and others which overwhelmingly supported the dominance of the family apply to today's seniors.* Thus, when we address the issue of the dominant agency in relation to the senior citizens under investigation, we explore the family, in particular the role that their parents played in the socialization process. However, even when we narrow our focus to the parent-child relationship, we are still faced with myriad ways in which parents interact with their children. To help us choose which aspects of this relationship to concentrate on, we turned to two bodies of literature: familial socialization and prosocial behavior.

Familial Socialization

The childhood socialization literature has traditionally focused on the *transmission* of attitudes or ideas. The importance of family, teachers, and other significant adults in how children are politically socialized is evident in three popular explanatory models developed during the 1960s and 1970s by researchers such as Greenstein, Renshon, Dennis, and others. The *accumulation model*, for example, argues that a child's attitudes, involvement, and behavior are little more than an

accumulation of the specific and direct learning which result from direct teaching, usually by adults. According to the *identification model*, inadvertent transmission of political behavior (partisanship, interest, etc.) occurs when a child imitates the behavior of some significant adult. And the *interpersonal transfer model* suggests that in relationships with figures of authority (such as the president or policemen), an adult establishes modes of interaction which are similar to those s/he experienced with persons of authority in his/her early life. These models were not seen as acting in isolation, but in concert with one another.

Greenstein's findings, for example, in his pioneering study, *Children and Politics* (1974), reflect these models. His study focused on 659 children in New Haven, Connecticut, between the ages of 9-13 -- what he calls the "latency years" when children move from "near ignorance of adult politics to awareness of the most conspicuous features of the adult political arena" (1). His famous "benevolent leader" finding -- that children view political leaders such as the president as helpful, caring, and protective -- is tied to the accumulation and interpersonal transfer models, while his finding that party identification is transmitted early (over half had a party preference by age 9) supports the accumulation and identification models (96-102).

Support for these models is also evident in research conducted by Hess and Torney (1965). In a study of 200 sibling pairs, they discovered that the direct relationship between family influence and political behavior was very evident. Siblings had more consistent attitudes than unrelated children did. Party identification and corresponding positive attitudes were transferred, especially around election time. Higher parental political interest and efficacy corresponded to higher child political interest and efficacy. They found that the family was most important for early attachment to party, government and country (1965, 192). In another study, Hess and Torney found that children who saw their fathers as powerful ("can make anyone do what he wants") tended to be more informed and interested in political matters (1965, 193). Hess and Torney concluded, "the child is taught expectations and values about political matters in preparation for future behavior" (193).

In sum, we are persuaded that for today's seniors at least, parents had the most opportunity to influence their children's future behavior because of the "unique physical and emotional dependency of the child" (Davies, 1965). *Childhood socialization models further suggested the importance of direct teaching, role modeling and parent-child interaction.* One of the most interesting, and most useful, studies from this era (1960s-1970s) was most concerned with the implications of the interpersonal transfer model. Chaffee, McLeod and Wackman (1973)

focused on structural constraints in the family and their capacity to indirectly shape a child's political development.

The Chaffee Typology

Chaffee, McLeod and Wackman researched the relationship between adolescent political participation and family communication patterns. Focusing their attention on the level of open discussion encouraged (concept-oriented communication), and the level of social disharmony tolerated (socio-oriented communication), they created a typology in which families high in both categories (*pluralistic*) typically produced children with the highest political knowledge, campaign activity, awareness, affect, and news media usage while those low in both categories (*laissez-faire*) produced the children with the lowest activity, interest and so on. Their methods for measuring family communication patterns are discussed in the next chapter and replicated in this study. Figure 2.1 presents the Chaffee typology in greater detail (1973, 351).

FIGURE 2.1 CHAFFEE'S FAMILY COMMUNICATION PATTERN TYPOLOGY

Concept-oriented communication (level of open discussion encouraged)			
		Low	High
Socio-oriented Communication (level of social disharmony tolerated)	Low	Laissez-faire	Consensual
	High	Protective	Pluralistic

This study is most interested in identifying *pluralistic* families through a series of questions suggested by Chaffee and included in the study survey. (See Chapter Four.) According to Chaffee: "These families emphasize the development of strong and varied concept-relations in an environment comparatively free of social restraints. The child is encouraged to explore new ideas and is often exposed to controversial material; thus, he can make up his own mind without fear that reaching a different conclusion from his parents will endanger social relations in the family" (351). After surveying the parents of the children in their sample, Chaffee et al. found that those adults who described their families of origin as pluralistic "ranked above the median on every measure of politicization" (362). They concluded, "the influences of family communication on a person's

development toward citizenship may well persist throughout his life" (363).

More typically, however, since high levels of political participation are rare in the general population, we expect to find survey respondents describing their childhood home environments as laissez-faire, protective or consensual. According to Chaffee, laissez-faire families emphasize neither socio nor concept oriented communication. Children are not discouraged from challenging parental views, and they are not encouraged to express independent ideas (351). Laissez-faire children and their parents are below average in all aspects of political participation (361).

Protective families stress harmonic or socio-relations at the expense of debate and controversy. Children are encouraged to get along with others and to avoid conflict. Children are discouraged from arguing and given little opportunity to think independently (351). Lying diagonally in the matrix are consensual families who stress both harmony and controversy. Children are exposed to different points of view, encouraged to express themselves, but within a context consonant with the parental opinions. From the children's perspective, they should adopt their parent's views to avoid family conflict (351).

Using this typology, Roberts et al. (1975) found that pluralistic homes, and consensual to a lesser extent, produced children more interested in political campaigns and more

inclined to have political conversations with their parents. Sheinkopf (1973) had similar results; pluralistic parents were most apt to have politically active children, followed closely by consensual families (Atkin, 1981, 322).

Thus, political socialization studies make it clear that certain variables associated with the socialization process while not political in themselves (i.e. a family's level of social restraint) are, in fact, situational factors, and can have significant consequences on future *political* engagement. Specifically, the Chaffee findings suggest family communication patterns can have a major impact on adult political behavior.

Prosocial Behavior

Another related body of literature, produced primarily by students of psychology and sociology, focuses on determinants of "prosocial behavior." According to Eisenberg and Mussen, "prosocial behavior refers to voluntary actions that are intended to help or benefit another individual or group of individuals" (3). Since many types of political activity can also be defined in this way, we believe that exploring literature devoted to "the roots of" prosocial behavior might prove worthwhile in identifying new variables that occur during the childhood socialization process. Like some of the variables found significant in the political socialization literature, important prosocial

variables, while not specifically political in nature, might be useful nonetheless in predicting future *political* activity.

The link between this kind of literature and what we think of as mainstream political socialization literature, such as the study conducted by Chaffee *et al.*, becomes more obvious when we look at studies included in Eisenberg and Mussen's *The Roots of Prosocial Behavior* (1989). Their extensive literature review discusses the usefulness of a wide range of "determinants." For example, in terms of family socialization, they find that the nature of the family environment (permissive or strict), the quality of parent-child interactions (nurturant or aloof), parental role models, and specific childrearing practices (particularly discipline techniques) appear to have direct bearing on the child's prosocial tendencies (67). The similarities between these determinants and Chaffee's communication patterns and home environment situational characteristics are striking.

Again, like the "identification model" discussed in political socialization literature, prosocial literature recognizes the importance of the actions children observe in their role models. Not surprisingly, children tend to imitate prosocial actions, even when exposure was brief (Rice and Grusec, 1975; Rushton, 1975). More nurturant models are more likely to be imitated (Moore and Eisenberg, 1984, 148). Most studies suggest that it is more often what a model *does*, rather than what s/he

says, that influences the child's subsequent behavior (Eisenberg and Mussen, 1989, 86).

The Altruistic Personality

In this regard, Eisenberg and Mussen make reference to a pioneering study called the *The Altruistic Personality* (1988), published by Oliner and Oliner. Using indepth interviews to explore the life histories of 406 rescuers of Jews in Nazi Germany to those of a matched sample of nonrescuers, Oliner and Oliner found that although no one developmental course determined such selfless behavior, there were important parental influences:

It begins in close family relationships in which parents model caring behavior... Parental discipline tends toward leniency; children frequently experience it as almost imperceptible. It includes a heavy dose of reasoning... Physical punishments are rare... parents set high standards they expect their children to meet, particularly with regard to caring for others... Parents themselves model such behaviors, not only in relation to their children but also toward other family members and neighbors. Because they are expected to care for and about others while simultaneously being cared for, children are encouraged to develop qualities associated with caring (249).

Because the development of an altruistic (selfless) predisposition was not dependent on any single event or experience, Oliner and Oliner discovered that rescuers tended to

be of four types, depending on what constituted the primary source of their psychological strength and values. One of those reasons was strong and cohesive family bonds. According to Oliner and Oliner, "Parental values emphasized caring for others, dependability, and self-reliance. A strong religious commitment in household was usual. There was, in general, a positive attitude toward others" (184-5). (The other three reasons were: close contact with Jews; broad social commitment to society as a whole; and egalitarian feelings.) In light of research question three, the Oliner study suggested that significant attention be paid to the value of family role modeling, religious commitment in the household, and parental discipline practices when explaining later adult prosocial behavior.

Oliner and Oliner's emphasis on psycho-social relationships in their study can be contrasted with the emphasis on autonomy cited in studies such as *The Authoritarian Personality* (Adorno et al., 1938). While the Adorno et al. study strengthens the case for focusing attention on the link between early socialization techniques and later behavior, its methods (i.e. types of questions asked) are not as relevant to this study as those used by Oliner and Oliner. For example, the Adorno group constructed two scales: the Ethnocentrism Scale (E Scale) for people hostile to "aliens" in general, and the Fascist Scale (F Scale) for authoritarian tendencies. High scorers for both tended to come

from families whose parents were punitive, harsh and status driven. They were conformist, obedient, punitive, moralistic, rigid, compulsive, unimaginative, and emotionally constricted (255). Adorno et al.'s "genuine liberal" represented the ideal type, low on both scales (255).

The Oliner study is similar to the Adorno et al. study in the type of home environment that fostered low scorers, and the fact that Adorno found different types of low scorers just as Oliner found different types of rescuers. However, because the questions asked are more relevant, because the type of behavior being studied is more similar to that being measured in this study, and because the methodology is more sociologically rather than psychologically based, this study relies more heavily on the Oliner study than the Adorno study. Specifically, this study adopts the idea that altruistic behavior in adulthood is related in part to a certain type of parent-child home environment. Aspects of that environment include: caring behavior modeled by parents, lax discipline, little to no physical punishment, high standards of behavior, strong family bonds, an emphasis on self-reliance, and a strong religious commitment.

While the importance of parental bonds in general is well-documented, studies attempting to separate the effects of maternal affection from paternal affection have been less successful. Some find mothers more important to later prosocial behavior, others do not (Hoffman and Saltzstein, 1967; Feshbach,

1973; Hoffman, 1975). Other studies such as those by Baumrind, have attempted to combine the effects of nurturance with other specific dimensions of parental behavior and determine the combined effects on prosocial behavior.

The Baumrind Typology

In an extensive, longitudinal study, Baumrind studied four aspects of parent behavior: nurturance, control, maturity demands and parent-child communication. Intensive observations, teacher's ratings, interviews and psychological tests were used to evaluate the children when they were preschoolers and again when they were nine years old. By clustering parental ratings on these four dimensions, Baumrind derived three major types or patterns of child rearing from her research. Quoting from Baumrind, Eisenberg and Mussen describe these types as follows: (1989, 80-81)

(1) **Authoritative parents** are warm, loving, responsive and supportive. They respect their children's independence, personality characteristics, point of view, interests, and motives; they communicate well with their children, encouraging give and take in discussions, and being clear about the reasons for directives. At the same time, they are controlling and demand mature behavior, guiding their children's activities firmly and requiring them to contribute to family functioning by helping with household tasks.

(2) **Authoritarian parents** are highly controlling, rely heavily on coercive discipline, and provide relatively little warmth. They attempt to instill conventional values such as respect for authority, work and tradition, and they do not discuss their decisions or rules.

(3) **Permissive parents** are nurturant, but lax in disciplining or rewarding their children. They are not controlling and make few maturity demands, allowing their children to regulate their own activities as much as possible.

Baumrind concludes that authoritative childrearing is the only pattern that consistently (and significantly) produces children high in social competence and social responsibility and fails to produce incompetent children (low in both social competence and social responsibility) in the preschool years and middle childhood. Her results suggest that the development of a child's predisposition for prosocial behavior is regulated by patterns of parent behavior, rather than by single dimensions like warmth or control (Eisenberg and Mussen, 1989, 81).

Returning to Chaffee's findings concerning pluralistic families, *if* there is an important link between prosocial behavior studies and political socialization studies, we would expect that pluralistic families use authoritative parenting. Both pluralistic families and authoritative parents encourage independent thinking and debate. Likewise, both laissez-faire families and permissive parents leave their children alone. We would expect both protective and consensual families to be more authoritarian because in both cases the parents want more control over attitudes or actions. For this reason, and because Baumrind's typology dovetails so well with the Oliner study

findings, questions designed to measure Baumrind's typology are included in the study and discussed in Chapter Four.

Many other studies that focus more specifically on discipline techniques, or on early assignment of responsibility, support Baumrind's findings. Studies of the former suggest that when parents react to transgressions with reasoning, pointing out consequences for themselves and others, they are modeling consideration, concern, and taking responsibility for one's actions. Thus, use of reasoning enhances the development of prosocial behavior (Eisenberg and Mussen, 82). (See also, Zahn-Waxler, 1979; Hoffman and Saltzstein, 1967; Hoffman, 1970; Feshbach, 1973; Kuczynski, 1982.)

Studies concerning early assignment of responsibility find that in general, it enhances children's prosocial tendencies. Researchers speculate that the relationship between the two is caused by a combination of societal praise for responsible behavior, empathetic feelings evoked by such behavior, and a heightened self-concept as a "helpful person" (Eisenberg and Mussen, 1989, 91). (See also, Whiting and Whiting, 1975; Eisenberg et al., 1987; Staub, 1979; Bronfenbrenner, 1970.)

While warm, nurturant relationships foster prosocial behavior, harsh and abusive treatment clearly has the opposite effect. A study of toddlers by Main and George (1985) found abused children most often reacted to a peer's distress with fear, aggression, or anger as opposed to the concern, sadness or

empathy displayed by the nonabused children (Eisenberg and Mussen, 79). Thus, if there is a connection between the positive home environment as described by Chaffee and future political behavior, and if that connection extends to one between Chaffee and Baumrind, then, we might speculate that a negative home environment not only leads to decreased prosocial behavior, but also to decreased political engagement.

Literature concerning determinants of prosocial behavior provide abundant evidence that many aspects of family interaction contribute to its development. However, the effects of factors such as gender, social class, family size and ordinal position are so inconsistent, authors like Eisenberg and Mussen conclude that generalizations are impossible (58-60). Most of these studies focus on modeling, reward and punishment, reasoning, and nurturing.

Is there a Link?

Although the evidence is anecdotal, literature concerning the Gray Panthers also suggests a connection between political socialization and prosocial studies and future political activity. One of the few written sources of information on this group is an autobiography by the founder herself, Maggie Kuhn. In her book, *No Stone Unturned* (1991), she describes her upbringing as one that encouraged a social conscience, independence, helping others, and argument; and discouraged

self-absorption. Concerning religion, she writes: "Above all else, mine was a church-going family" (25), and later: "I have always liked the intellectual quality of Presbyterianism, its constant analysis of ethical values and social justice... Presbyterians love to argue" (94). Maggie's father is referred to as strict, "driving and domineering" (72). And describing herself (and her friends) at age 65 as she faced retirement, she writes: "We didn't feel old. In fact, we felt more radical and full of new ideas, more opinionated and less constrained by convention than when we graduated from college... We wanted to continue to be involved in social action bearing on important public issues of the day" (130). Her writings about her family and childhood reflect many of the characteristics (i.e., altruistic role modeling, argument encouraged, church-going) attributed to parents of the more altruistic, politically active adults in the Chaffee, Baumrind, and Oliner studies. Her father sounds more authoritarian than authoritative, and may more accurately reflect the powerful father finding by Hess and Torney (1965, 193).

In a video tape containing an interview with six Panthers titled *"Making a Difference, Lifelong Political Activists"* (Cox, 1993), all six describe their parents as excellent role models who taught "social responsibility," "concern for the underdog," and "love in action." One set of parents were missionaries, another were Quakers who "stood firm for what they believed in,"

and another set were socialists. Their comments also reflect the altruistic role modeling attributed to the parents of rescuers in the Oliner study.

Only a few prosocial behavior studies (Oliner and Oliner, for example) have attempted to connect early socialization techniques with adult prosocial behavior. This study hopes to make a similar attempt by looking at some of these variables in terms of political behavior. Specifically, the literature suggests that one's tendency to be concerned about others is enhanced by the following variables: role modeling; authoritative parenting; nurturing parents; and early responsibility assignment to children. It suggests that a tendency **not** to be concerned may be heightened by: authoritarian or permissive parenting and harsh/abusive treatment. This study attempts to determine whether these same situational factors contribute to increased or decreased political engagement.

ADULT SOCIALIZATION

Traditionally, socialization research has focused most of its efforts on childhood, assuming most of this process takes place in our early, "formative" years, but more recently researchers like Sigel, and many others, have turned their attention to adult socialization. Within the adult socialization literature researchers have focused a great deal of their collective energy on the degree of change we can expect over the lifespan, emphasizing the importance of viewing the life cycle as composed of an interrelated series of discrete phases (Sigel, 1989, 416). Not surprisingly, most conclude it is characterized by change as well as continuity.

Change Versus Continuity Over Time

Studies of change versus continuity fall primarily into two groups. The first group is concerned with continuity of *attitudes*, the second with continuity of *activity*. Most of the well known life-span research by political sociologists such as Jennings and Niemi, Campbell, and Newcomb, and Sears fall into the former group.

For example, Jennings and Niemi's classic text, *Generations and Politics* (1981), describes their two-wave panel study of parents and teens conducted in 1965 and 1973. The authors

concluded that "a variety of sociopolitical attitudes were consistently less stable for the filial respondents than for their middle aged parents across the eight-year hiatus between interviews. These results were interpreted as providing support for... the presumption that with increasing political experience, political attitudes gradually become imbued with richer historical precedent and are consequently less likely to change" (Jennings and Markus, 1984, 1001). These results were further supported by a third wave of the same panel study conducted in 1982. While the attitudes of parents remained stable, the attitudes of the children became much more stable than in the earlier study. Jennings and Markus suggested that many attitudes "crystalize" between the mid-twenties and mid-thirties and are likely to "define one's outlook for some time thereafter" (1984, 1017).

Another three-wave panel study was conducted by Theodore Newcomb, but in his case, the study spanned sixty years (1930-1991)! In his initial study of students at Bennington College, Vermont (in the 1930s), he discovered that their attitudes during those "impressionable years" became more liberal as their years at college increased. Returning to the same group of women in the 1960s, his subsequent study focused on the degree of change in their attitudes over 25 years and found remarkable stability (Newcomb et al., 1967). Again, in 1991, one last study of those same Bennington college women by Alwin, Cohen and

Newcomb again focused on the persistence of attitudes as those women entered late adulthood and old age and still found "a high level of stability in sociopolitical attitudes" (Alwin, 1991, 158).

Related to the issue of life span trends in the stability of attitudes has been the issue of life span trends in the intensity of feelings about those attitudes. Even before *The American Voter* (1960), studies suggested that under normal circumstances the intensity of partisanship increases the longer that attitude is held (Jennings and Markus, 1984, 1001). (See also Converse, 1976; Shively, 1979.)

The picture these studies present is far from clear, however. While continuity usually prevails, time and time again, researchers find "more discontinuity than expected." Jennings and Niemi, for example, found that although parents were more stable in their attitudes than their children, they still changed their attitudes more frequently than the researchers expected them to. They found that orientations were likely to change particularly if challenged by others or by events. Reinforcement slowed change but didn't stop it (Jennings and Niemi, 1974, 380-4). They concluded: "Moderate stability is likely to characterize most of the population on most political attributes.... [However,] pockets of instability will exist. Both change and stability abound... sometimes one predominates and sometimes the other" (Jennings and Niemi, 1974, 380).

Complicating the picture further are findings by Gahart and Sears in their study of whites' racial prejudices in the early 1970s. They discovered that stability in attitudes increased predictably from age 21 to age 60, but then dropped "enormously" for individuals over 60. They had no evidence to suggest why that was so, but wondered if it indicated "more openness to modern ideas than usually expected" (Sears, 1982, 196-202).

This study, however, is concerned with the latter group; research concerning continuity of activity. Unfortunately, for a variety of reasons (including methodological concerns and disciplinary paradigms) few of these types of studies exist. And like literature devoted to continuity of attitudes, the findings are contradictory. In response, Roberta Sigel, editor of *Political Learning in Adulthood* (1989), suggests the value of more studies along these lines.

Sigel takes a life span, developmental approach to the study of adult political behavior. She argues that "while we do have much information on how adults at a given moment act or react -- their vote, policy preferences, and so on -- we lack systematic knowledge of whether such behavior is a carryover from values learned during childhood or whether it has arisen in response to changed social or personal circumstances not anticipated in childhood" (1989, x). In other words, Sigel is pointing out an enormous gap in the literature. She is saying that while we know that, for most individuals, some political

activities change and some stay the same, we don't know specifically what activities change over time or why.

Sigel also stresses both individual change over time and the impact of societal change on individuals (xi). "We conceive of individuals as both actors and acted-upon who have a lifelong capacity to learn and change, although differing from each other in their capacity and inclination for learning. Political socialization is "an ongoing, continuous process marked by both continuity and change" (xii). She suggests that "we cease thinking in terms of continuity versus change. Continuity and change should be perceived as complementary" (464).

Sigel includes an article by Steckenrider and Cutler in her book which presents a theoretical argument for why we might expect change to occur in the political activity level of senior citizens. These authors note that the transition from middle age to old age encompasses a number of role transitions pertaining to family, work, residence and government services and benefits. Although changes include both gains and losses, and vary considerably from individual to individual, *typically* one or more of the following types of changes occur: empty nest (youngest child leaves home); retirement; death of spouse (and/or parent); become eligible for pensions, Social Security, Medicare; develop chronic illness; have more free time and more independence (Sigel, 1989, 80).

Steckenrider and Cutler believe that "overall, many of the roles assumed in old age suggest *increased* political interest and participation. Retirement and empty nest stages provide freedom from responsibilities and more time to devote to politics. Men and women who were never 'on welfare' and who do not consider personal or business 'tax breaks' as direct government benefits to them, may find themselves in the role of 'recipients' -- which can lead to increased political attention, information and ultimately participation. An important and clearly related pattern among older people today is the propensity to become members of mass organizations such as the AARP and the National Council of Senior Citizens (Cutler, 1981b, 1982). Many of these organizations have a clear political agenda (Pratt, 1976), but even their nonpolitical actions can increase the older person's political interest and involvement (Verba and Nie, 1972; Trela, 1971 and 1972; Cutler and Minns, 1977)" (Sigel, 1989, 80).

Sigel, Cutler and others reflect a *political* socialization theory known as the *lifelong openness* model. This model speculates that we are equally open to sources (or "agents") of socialization throughout our lives. These sources include the family, school, peers, the media, and significant others. This study, however, is not built on such an assumption. There is, in fact, considerable debate concerning an individual's "openness" to political learning/change after childhood. Three

other political socialization theories compete with the lifelong openness model: persistence, life cycle and generational theories. Each offers persuasive evidence to suggest that some periods of our lives are "more equal" than others in their ability to shape our political attitudes and activities.

Political Socialization Theories

While lifelong openness assumes political learning occurs during childhood and may or may not endure beyond it, the persistence model takes a much narrower perspective -- all political learning takes place during childhood. Suggested first by Herbert Hyman in his classic *Political Socialization*, persistence theory argues "humans must learn their political behavior early and well and persist in it" (Hyman, 1959, 10). Primacy and structuring principles further suggest that general political orientations are learned during childhood, childhood learning shapes (structures) later modifications, and subsequent alterations are minor (Searing, 1973). Individuals resist change because they become accustomed to and comfortable with a given set of orientations (Jennings and Niemi, 1981, 19). This model dominated the thinking of socialization researchers in the 1960s (and is still popular to a more limited degree). Its assumptions led to the conclusion that family and school were the most important agents of socialization. Relating this research to this study suggests that the politically active

senior citizen is most likely a politically active adult born and raised within a politically active family.¹

The other two models stand between these polar opposites. Both build upon, but modify, the persistence model. The *generational* model (sometimes called the "impressionable years" model) also argues strong persistence in general, but it allows for considerable new socialization and/or resocialization with lasting effects during the formative, "impressionable years" of late adolescence/young adulthood. These changes will occur if, (1) there are particularly powerful social and political movements in force at the time such as a war or an economic depression. "These societal forces induce systematic shifts in the attitudinal makeup of an entire cohort" (Jennings and Markus, 1984, 1001). Studies which focus on college students are most likely to take this approach. (See, for example, Jennings and Niemi, 1981; Jennings and Markus, 1984.)

The *life cycle* model argues that while persistence is the rule, the potential for and actuality of change is greater at some stages than at others and the range of affected orientations is narrow. It suggests that while we do most of our political learning/modeling in childhood, we are still vulnerable to outside influences in our adult years -- particularly at certain life stages such as college, marriage, and retirement.

In sum, all four models acknowledge the importance of childhood socialization. The persistence model bases all adult

attitudes and behavior on childhood experiences. The generational model suggests that its effects may be mitigated by strong social forces during one's late teens, early twenties. The life cycle model suggests that its effects may be modified by events which occur at certain vulnerable points in an individual's life when they are particularly open to new ideas and change. Finally, the lifelong openness model argues that the effects of childhood socialization can easily be erased by adult socialization. The first model, persistence, emphasizes continuity, the last model, lifelong openness, emphasizes change.

Of these four models, the life cycle model is the most persuasive. Noting the obvious, as Sigel does, that individuals exhibit *both* continuity and change over the life span, the persistence theory places too much importance on childhood and doesn't allow for the growth/change in attitudes that often occurs during one's college years, or during the twenties when individuals enter the work force and or marriage. It also doesn't take generational effects such as war into account. The lifelong openness model doesn't place *enough* importance on the impact of childhood socialization.

The generational model builds upon the persistence model, but also takes larger societal forces into account. However, it doesn't account for change after one passes beyond the "impressionable years" as well as life cycle theory does. Because life

cycle theorists suggest that change usually occurs in response to major life changes and/or period influences, the theory is more intuitively appealing because it allows for growth/change after a person reaches adulthood but stipulates that the change needs a strong catalyst. The great staying power of values, attitudes, and behaviors acquired early is acknowledged, but the impact of adult experiences such as marriage and retirement is given greater credit for the ability to mitigate or reverse the results of childhood socialization.

The life cycle model (also the lifelong openness model) allows us to consider the *possibility* that change may be great when we are at last relieved from the burdens of child rearing and daily employment responsibilities. The lifelong openness and life cycle theories encourage us to expect increased political activity. The persistence and generational models argue that continuity more accurately describes the behavior of most adults. Those who have always been active continue to be active; those who have been politically active "persist" in that type of behavior; those who have not been politically engaged do not become that way late in life. Although a few may "deviate" from this "norm," we should not expect people to change their levels of political activity until forced to do so by the physical decline that inevitably causes seniors to decrease or cease many daily activities. Time may or may not coincide with the achievement of senior citizen status.

In addition to political socialization theories, four principle *psychosocial* theories have emerged which also focus on continuity versus change in terms of activity (political or otherwise): activity, disengagement, continuity, and exchange theory. With a few exceptions, these studies have been conducted by sociologists and psychologists, not political scientists, and have been concerned with discovering determinants of "successful" aging.

Psychosocial Theories

Successful aging has generally been equated with happiness in one's old age. Activity theory, for example, assumes "the continued maintenance of a high degree of involvement in social life is an important basis for deriving and sustaining satisfaction" (Lipman and Ehrlich, 1986, 55). In other words, happy seniors are busy seniors. However, the findings from activity theory studies are mixed.

Some find support for a relationship between continued activity and life satisfaction. For example, Lemon et al. distinguished activities as informal (friends, relatives) formal (volunteering) and solitary. They found some support for a relationship between informal activity and life satisfaction but nothing consistent for the other two (Lemon, 1972). Longino and Kart found solitary activities had no effect, formal activities had a negative effect and informal activities had a positive

effect on life satisfaction (Longino and Kart, 1982). (See also Cutler, 1977; Babchuck and Booth, 1969; and Peppers, 1976.)

Others find that the opposite or decreased activity is the rule. *Disengagement* theory became very popular when first proposed by Cumming and Henry (1961). They argued that aging was a process of gradual physical, psychological and social withdrawal (Lipman and Ehrlich, 1986, 53). They assumed the withdrawal was mutual -- the elderly withdrew from their occupational and social roles, and society let them go. Personality changes were either the cause or effect of this decreased involvement. When withdrawal was voluntary, life satisfaction was high. As Neugarten explained it, the original meaning of "disengagement" referred to the onset of old age when ego functions were turned inward. With the change from active to passive modes of mastering the environment, there was also a movement of energy away from the outer-world to an inner-world orientation (1968, 140). (See also Longino and Kart, 1982; and Hausknecht, 1962.) This theory was largely discredited by further research which found those who withdrew were less satisfied. Disengagement was considered neither universal nor inevitable. (Lipman and Smith, 1968; Havighurst et al., 1968; Lipman and Ehrlich, 1986; Glenn, 1969.)

More recently disengagement theory has been divorced from its association with "successful aging," and has made somewhat of a comeback. "Neo" disengagement theorists include Hazan

(1983) and Kastenbaum (1993). Hazan argues discontinuity of ties and past involvements can facilitate the construction of new identities. The breakdown of previous ties allowed older Jewish participants at an English day center to devote their energies to the development of a new social structure. They created a disengaged insular society with an egalitarian structure in which members freely helped one another while attempting to maintain a high degree of autonomy. Kastenbaum, on the other hand, writes about "encrusted elders" in Arizona, arguing "encrustation is a survival strategy" (180). They reject a world that no longer seems interested in work, decency, loyalty and other familiar virtues (182). True only of some elderly, most ("nonencrusted") seniors are simply "settled," and take evasive action only when necessary (174). Rather than worrying about whether or not "disengaged" elders were happier than other elders, current studies use disengagement as a category into which a certain segment of seniors fit, and try to explain why they are that way (i.e. withdrawn, apathetic, etc.). They suggest that while it's true that disengagement is neither universal nor inevitable it is true for a significant minority of seniors.

Continuity theory (much like persistence theory) argues that in the process of becoming adults, persons develop habits, preferences, etc. that become part of their personalities. These habits and preferences are brought into old age. Neither

activity nor inactivity assumes happiness. Instead, a senior citizen's level of activity depends upon "lifelong established patterns and self-concepts" (Lipman and Ehrlich, 56). (See also Neugarten, 1966; and Becker, 1968.)

This theory is the most persuasive perhaps because of the wide support it has received in the literature. For example, Atchley finds: "continuity of family and leisure roles as well as maintenance of the 'style' of activity preference." Atchley concludes, "individuals are able to maintain a relatively continuous identity of self into old age" (1971, 99). Similarly Chambre notes, "involvement is a continuation of behavior patterns established earlier in life" (1984, 297). Itzin also echoes this finding concluding continuity characterizes the activity patterns of many people throughout life and into old age (1983). Morgan sums it up best when he writes: "Retired people spend their time in the same kinds of activities that engage employed persons when they are not working, retired persons just spend more time doing those activities" (1985).

Exchange theory offers a rational actor view of activity such that "voluntary social behavior is motivated by the expectation of the return or reward this behavior will bring from others" (Lipman and Ehrlich, 54). (See also Blau, 1964; and Lipman, 1982.) Change in activity levels is measured in terms of personal resources (financial, friends), or the power derived from an individual's association with others in a group

("power resources"). As power resources tend to decline with age, seniors attempt to balance their relationship with society in one of four ways: (1) withdrawal, (2) network extension, (3) status giving, (4) coalition formation (strongest of the balancing operations) (Dowd, 1979). Exchange theory suggests that variables concerning a senior's power resources, particularly the power derived from an individual's association with others in a group such as the Gray Panthers may be particularly important in this study. It also suggests that for most seniors, we can expect less activity as their power resources decline.

Criticisms of activity theory such as those by Chambre (1984) and Fox (1982) focus primarily on the difficulties of measuring activity levels. These criticisms are equally valid for any of the models mentioned in this section. To measure change over time, under the best possible conditions, one notes the position of some variable at a given point in time and calculates change in that position at some later time. Unfortunately, social science is seldom able to be so precise. Two of the best attempts to date were the follow-up 1967 and 1991 Bennington College studies discussed above. Critics of activity theory methodology make several good points. For example, they note that researchers often simply compare levels of participation instead of looking at continuity of a particular activity. In addition, many ignore the importance of new

activities, changes within a role or activity sphere, the time spent in a given activity, and what occurred during that time.²

Combining poli-social and psychological literature

In sum, it seems that a good predictor of political engagement after sixty will be political engagement before sixty. The persistence, generational, activity and continuity models convincingly argue continuity more accurately describes the behavior of most adults. Those who have always been active continue to be active, those politically active "persist" in that type of behavior, those not politically engaged do not become that way late in life. Although a few may "deviate" from this "norm," we should not expect people to change their levels of political activity once they retire, until forced by the physical decline that inevitably causes seniors to decrease or cease most daily activity.

For those who do show change, these models do little to help us determine which direction it will take. While the lifelong openness and life cycle theories encourage us to expect increased political activity, disengagement and exchange theories argue the opposite will be true for most. Frequent methodological critiques of these theories point out the difficulty of measuring change over time. These difficulties may partially explain the gap Sigel points out in the literature. While we know that, for most individuals, some

political activities change and some stay the same, we don't know specifically what activities change over time or why.

In Sum

Our study revolves around four research questions:

- (1) Can we characterize the political engagement of seniors as one of change or continuity over the life course?
- (2) If there is change, is it in the direction of more or less involvement?
- (3) How do the childhood socialization experiences of highly politically engaged seniors compare with the childhood socialization experiences of less politically engaged seniors?
- (4) Which of the characteristics we are studying are the most important in distinguishing between the most engaged and the least?

In terms of these questions, socialization literature reviewed in this chapter led the author to make the following **assumptions**:

- (1) Childhood is the major formative period for political orientations that will "persist" into adulthood for our study of senior citizens. What is acquired early is acquired best for this particular age cohort.

(2) The family is the primary socializing agent, whether or not the child is conscious of the impact. Within the family, we are socialized primarily by means of direct teaching, imitation and the nature of parent-child interaction.

(3) We learn best those things positively reinforced. Praise by the parent or praise for the parent encourages children to incorporate parental orientations into his/her own political makeup.

(4) Family communication patterns are important because they reflect elements of direct teaching, imitation and the nature of the parent-child relationship. Through family conversation parents have an opportunity to impart knowledge, teach values, and encourage or discourage certain types of behavior. Families that discourage conversation and/or debate not only limit the transfer of information and values but also discourage an exchange of ideas within the family and, in a larger sense, with society as well. Therefore, the socializing experience a child has will impact positively or negatively upon his/her adult behavior.

(5) Adult behavior for the benefit of society is "prosocial." Participating in politics within legal and social norms is also "prosocial."

(6) Adult political orientations/behaviors can change in response to a strong catalyst. The catalyzing event can occur at any point in a person's life but will be most likely to

produce change if it coincides with a period of transition in that person's life (i.e. retirement).

Based on these assumptions and the socialization literature, the following **hypotheses** were constructed:

(1) Continuity characterizes political engagement -- levels of political activity before and after 60 remain fairly constant. Thus, the greater the political engagement before sixty, the greater the political engagement after sixty.

(2) For those who show change instead of continuity, there will be no particular pattern. As many seniors will increase a particular activity as will decrease that activity.

(3) Childhood determinants of "prosocial" behavior are related to childhood determinants of political behavior. Some parental behaviors increase the potential for political activity as a senior citizen other behaviors decrease the potential for political activity as a senior citizen.

(4) Specifically, parental behaviors that increase the potential for political engagement as a senior citizen include:

- (a) authoritative parenting,
- (b) a pluralistic home environment,
- (c) altruistic/politically active role modeling,
- (d) emphasis on religion,
- (e) early assumption of responsibility, and

(f) parental partisanship.

On the other hand, opposing types of parental behaviors that may decrease the potential for political engagement as a senior citizen include:

- (a) authoritarian or permissive parenting,
- (b) a laissez-faire home environment,
- (c) nonaltruistic/politically inactive role modeling,
- (d) no emphasis on religion,
- (e) late or nonexistent assumption of responsibility,
- (f) parental nonpartisanship.

(5) Parental behaviors that increase the potential for political engagement as a senior (see 4 a-f) should be particularly evident in our Gray Panther sample.

Predicting participation

There were several goals in this chapter. The first was to place this study within the socialization literature in general. The second was to tie together various strands of research that seemed to "fit" together to make a more coherent whole. And finally, in terms of research question four, we want to identify variables from these different strands of literature that we can use to better explain the political participation of senior citizens. Ultimately, we will use these variables in multivariate statistical analysis to better predict the dependent variable, political engagement.

With the socialization variables that we want identified, we need to place them within the larger context of political engagement literature. Surprisingly, political socialization variables receive little attention in political participation studies, despite the fact that those studies draw variables from many different sources. Theoretically, if the socialization factors identified in this chapter are good predictors, they should be able to "hold their own" against the more well-documented participation variables currently recognized in the political science discipline. Therefore, a review of the current literature concerning participation variables follows in the next chapter along with the current literature concerning political attention. Because of our focus on seniors, we will be particularly interested in studies which consider the combined effects of age and associated participation variables such as retirement, health and education.

Chapter Two Notes

1. Searing et al., 1973, provide an excellent discussion of the structuring principle, but their research raises some doubts about its validity.
2. For more discussion about these types of methodological concerns, see Chapter Four on Methods and Measures.

CHAPTER 3: POLITICAL ENGAGEMENT LITERATURE

This study bridges the gap between subfields of political science. In Chapter Two we referenced both political socialization and prosocial behavior research. In this chapter we draw from both political participation and political communication literature. While the findings of this study offer much to socialization, prosocial behavior, and political communication research, they "fit" best into the participation literature because ultimately we are attempting to differentiate the most participatory senior citizens from the least. *This study is unique because it looks beyond the "usual suspects" found in the participation literature and draws primarily from the three other sources mentioned above.*

As we mentioned in Chapter One, another aspect of this study which sets it apart from other participation research is the way in which it stretches the meaning of political participation from one which includes simply voting and activity beyond voting to include another dimension -- *attention to politics*. Because of this perspective on participation, we prefer to use the term "**political engagement**" and define it to mean: *those activities of citizens by which they seek to better understand, influence or support government and politics*. We are interested in a variety of political activities, ranging from activities

requiring little energy, such as watching, reading, and listening to politics, to activities requiring a great deal of energy, such as attending rallies, working in elections, and protesting. The term "political engagement" is used in this study to encompass all three dimensions -- an attention dimension, a voting dimension and an activity dimension. *Although this study's distinction among three separate dimensions is unique, it does not remove it from participation studies.*

While we may want to take this broad, three dimensional approach, most available participation literature concentrates almost exclusively on voting and activities beyond voting. What little literature exists on the political attention dimension falls in the area of political communication research. *Therefore, when we refer to participation literature we are referring to studies concentrating on voting behavior and participation beyond voting, not to studies concerning political attention. For literature concerning political attention we will turn later to the subfield of political communication.*

Political Participation Literature

Current participation research is most interested in the present. Variables such as an individual's current level of education, income, feeling of efficacy, civic duty, political interest and so on, are widely considered to be important, if not the most important, determinants of political participation.

Therefore, any effort to differentiate politically engaged seniors from other less engaged seniors, must include these "usual suspects" in the study. These participation variables are useful for two reasons. First, they help us to differentiate our seniors, and second, they offer a standard against which to compare our less tested and more "unusual" socialization variables.

Of its two dimensions, voting has received the greatest attention by far. This attention is probably due to the fact that it is the most common form of active citizen participation in American politics. According to Rosenstone and Hansen, "since 1952, on average, 57 percent of the voting age population has cast a ballot in presidential election years. Beyond voting, electoral politics draws many fewer participants, especially as the costs of political involvement become more substantial" (1993, 41). Less attention is devoted to activities beyond voting. Research has been almost exclusively limited to a few key variables -- persuading, campaigning, giving, contacting, attending, signing, and protesting.

The participation literature review contained in this chapter is designed to explain what we already know about the political participation of citizens in general and senior citizens specifically. What we know is due in large part to data gathered by the National Election Studies (NES), conducted by the Center for Political Studies at the University of

Michigan. In election years since 1952, NES has interviewed a random sample of Americans of voting age in person. While the data collected by the NES is a rich source of information about voters widely available to students of American politics, its questions generally tap current attitudes, behaviors and characteristics. There seems to be an implicit assumption that current participation is the result of current characteristics. From this review, we can first select the variables we want to include in our study design, and secondly, form hypotheses about how these variables will affect the engagement levels of the seniors in our sample. A comparison of their predictive ability with that of the socialization variables discussed in Chapter Two will give us a basis for evaluating the contribution of socialization variables. Together, the combination of participation and socialization variables should enhance our overall understanding of, and ability to predict, political engagement (our goal in research question four).

Political Communication Literature

While few participation studies include political attention in their studies, unfortunately, most political communication literature is similarly unhelpful in terms of this study. Studies on political attention are quite young; researchers are increasingly turning their attention to the relationship between political communicators (especially those expressing their views

through the mass media) and the political behavior of the audience. Nimmo and Sanders, editors of *The Handbook of Political Communication* (1981) write: "At the core of political communication is the process of persuasion -- the reciprocal efforts of people to influence one another. The process takes many forms: for example, the dissemination of information; manipulation; propaganda; and a host of other means producing a complex matrix of media, persuasive modes and effects" (30). With persuasion as its focus, political communication literature is predominantly concerned with the **impact** of the media and mass communication on society. Attention to the audience is primarily concerned with how the media shapes or changes their attitudes and values, *not what variables help us to predict who watches, listens and reads.*

What literature exists falls into what is known as "the uses and gratifications" approach. McLeod and Becker provide a useful review of this literature in a chapter by the same name in Nimmo and Sanders (1981). Not surprisingly, research taking this approach encompasses the uses audiences make of the mass media as well as the gratifications sought and received for such use (68). Audiences are viewed as "active processors" rather than "passive receivers" of media messages (71). This literature suggests that media behavior reflects prior interests and preferences. From this we might assume that politically

interested individuals are more likely to pay attention to political media than those not interested in politics.

According to McLeod and Becker, uses and gratifications studies fall into five categories: (1) audience motives relevant to audience uses, (2) motive antecedents, (3) audience evaluations of the media's ability to meet their needs, (4) linkages between audience needs and uses, and (5) political effects of the media (86). Of these, we are most interested in audience needs or motivations or motive antecedents to help us predict which seniors will be more likely to be politically attentive. Unfortunately, these studies do not research the relationship between the variables traditionally associated with political participation (such as efficacy and trust) and media use. However, research on different motivations for use or nonuse of the political content of the media may help us to predict which of our seniors will tune in.

Blumler and McQuail suggest five different motivations for watching political news coverage on the television: vote guidance, reinforcement (of decisions already made), surveillance (of the political environment), excitement, and its anticipated utility in interpersonal situations. They also identify three reasons not to watch: alienation, partisanship, and it's not relaxing enough (McLeod and Becker, 1981, 87).

All of the motivations to watch political news coverage on the television (except excitement, perhaps) seem equally

applicable to newspaper reading, or radio listening. For example, Bogart writes: "Newspapers have their greatest following among people of higher education and social status, who are most at home with the printed word. Moreover, newspaper reading is an acquired habit that is strongest among people of maturity who are rooted by material self-interest and emotional attachments to the community that the newspaper represents" (1981, 54). We can also assume that two reasons not to watch -- alienation and partisanship -- are equally good motives not to read or listen. The motive of not watching television because "it's not relaxing enough," suggests that reading or listening may actually be an alternative for people in that category. Thus, for the purposes of this study, we will assume that the motivations suggested by Blumler and McQuail for watching the news also apply to radio listening and newspaper reading. The applicability of these motivations to our study seniors will be discussed below in the political attention section.

Organizing the literature

The remainder of this chapter is devoted to exploring variables associated with each dimension of political engagement -- the voting dimension, activity dimension and attention dimension. Whenever possible we include a discussion of a participation variable as it relates to the variable **age**, because of the study's focus on seniors.

Unfortunately, this type of data is rare in the literature. Researchers are aware that the variable age is important because it reflects something about the cumulative effect of our life experiences. Rosenstone and Hansen note that as people grow older, in general, their involvement in politics deepens (1993, 136). They find that "experience [age] gives people the skills they need to participate; experience places people into social networks through which they are more likely to be contacted and mobilized" (77). On a less positive level, Torres-Gil writes about the relationship between age and political activity by suggesting that greater age decreases the likelihood that a person will be physically capable of political activity (1976, 117).

While this awareness of the impact of age and other circumstances (such as the increasing numbers of senior adults perceived as well-off and productive) has led many to speculate about what happens when important predictors of participation interact with the variable age, few have actually researched that interaction. Research currently available tends to focus on the interrelationship between age and education, political interest, ideology, retirement, and health. Some studies look at these interrelationships across the life span, others confine themselves strictly to a senior population.

Rosenstone and Hansen (1993) argue that people participate in electoral politics because someone "encourages or inspires

them to take part" (161). Using this argument, certain characteristics make people more or less likely to first be the target of a political message and second to respond to that message. Resources, perceived rewards, and interests define our potential response to political persuasion (1993, 36). (Since persuasion is the essence of political communication, Rosenstone and Hansen's thesis supports the addition of a political attention dimension to the study of participation.) Thus, following the lead of Rosenstone and Hansen, we can look at the variables discussed below as characteristics which make someone more or less likely to be the target of mobilization efforts by friends, colleagues, politicians, activists or organized groups.

We can group these characteristics under two headings: social/demographic and political. The social/demographic variables can be further differentiated according to whether they refer to personal resources, social involvement or other more miscellaneous characteristics. These distinctions between types of social/demographic variables are suggested by Rosenstone and Hansen who see "personal resources," such as education, income, occupation, health and time, as characteristics which allow people to "afford" the costs of participation. "Social involvement" variables such as group involvement, senior center attendance and years in community not only offer social rewards for participation but also increase the likelihood of exposure to the mobilizing efforts of others (1993, 130-1).

Miscellaneous characteristics include variables such as age and residence.

According to Rosenstone and Hansen (1993), "the social matrix in which people live also structures political participation in consequential ways. People with dense webs of social contacts learn more about the candidates, the issues and the opportunities to take part. They have greater exposure to social incentives -- their obligations to others are more extensive, their opportunities to help others are more numerous, and their actions better scrutinized. Thus, the better connected people are socially, the more likely they are to take part in electoral politics" (156).

Rosenstone and Hansen's breakdown of social/demographic variables is used in this study with some exceptions. For example, there are more variables grouped under each subject heading in this study than in their research. Additionally, Rosenstone and Hansen include a section on candidate evaluations while this study ignores evaluations. And finally, Rosenstone and Hansen consider efficacy a personal resource, and ignore the effects of other political variables such as civic duty and partisanship. This study creates a separate category for these "political variables." Thus, the Rosenstone and Hansen breakdown is not used because we are replicating their research, it is used because it makes logical distinctions between groups of variables. In addition, the distinction between "personal

resources" and other types of variables is gaining momentum in political science literature, as we will discuss more fully below.

Social/Demographic Variables

Verba and Nie's *Participation in America: Political Democracy and Social Equality*, published in 1972, is a well known "classic" in the area of political participation. Their study, using data collected in a large-scale survey of the public in 1967, is based on the popular "socioeconomic model" (SES model) which explains participation as largely the result of one's social status (derived from a combination of education, income and occupation). Individuals of higher social status develop certain "civic orientations" that in turn lead to participation (126). The model suggests that the higher an individual's SES, the more politically relevant resources at his/her disposal, the greater the access to political information, the greater the capacity to process that information, and the greater the awareness of the impact of political decisions on personal interests (Conway, 1991, 21). Testing this model, Verba and Nie concluded: "The standard socioeconomic model works very well for our overall measure of activity and for campaign and communal activity. It works less well -- but quite well nonetheless -- for voting... SES serves as a baseline which

together with intervening variables such as civic orientations, help to explain variance in participation" (135).

Most agree that taking these characteristics into consideration is a critical first step for explaining political participation, and a variety of explanations exist, which taken together, help us to understand why this is so. One explanation focuses on the relationship between social circumstances and life experiences. Life experiences affect one's perspective on the past and expectations for the future. The life experience of being poor, for example, results in someone who probably values economic security more than someone who has never known poverty. These experiences change with economic and social conditions, and their effects also change (See Inglehart, 1990; and Conway, 1991, 16).

Another explanation argues that social characteristics affect the social roles people play. Social roles affect what we expect of others, what others expect of us, and what we expect of ourselves. For example, people of higher socioeconomic status (SES) are expected to vote. As a result, they are more likely to vote or to claim they have voted, even when they have not, than are individuals of lower SES (Conway, 1991, 37).

A third explanation is that social status affects the flow of political communications, with individuals in some social locations (i.e., those for whom political news is job related)

receiving more political stimuli than others. Higher levels of political stimulation and often the content of political communication stimulates political interest and involvement and increases political engagement. (See Litt, 1963; Langton and Jennings, 1968; Kornberg *et al.*, 1973.)

Lastly, many argue that social characteristics affect both citizens' stakes in political outcomes and their perceptions of those stakes. While all citizens are affected by governmental decisions, not all see with equal clarity the relationship between those decisions and their interests. For example, awareness of the connection between political participation, government programs and government benefits is lower among lower-income groups (Conway, 1991, 17).

Thus, according to the SES model, the degree to which citizens participate in politics and the manner in which they do so is determined in large part by their social circumstances. Originally, those circumstances were defined as the sum of education, income and occupation (Verba and Nie, 1972). Over time however, these social circumstances have expanded to include not only education, income and occupation but also variables such as one's social class, group membership, and organizational involvement. Closely correlated with these circumstances are demographic characteristics such as sex, age, race, ethnicity, place of residence, and marital status. These variables affect one's level of resources available and the

development of attitudes which underlie various types of political participation (Conway, 1991, 15).

Based on the Rosenstone and Hansen text (1993) and more recently Brady, Verba and Schlozman's article entitled "*Beyond SES: A Resource Model of Political Participation*" (1995), this more inclusive sense of available resources is becoming a popular model for explaining participation, supplanting the less inclusive SES model. Rosenstone and Hansen describe "personal resources," as characteristics which allow people to "afford" the costs of participation. Brady, Verba and Schlozman argue that resources such as time, money and skills *flow from* SES characteristics and both "enable and restrict individual activity" (272). They believe that resources are a major determinant of the *decision* to participate, while constraints on free time control the *amount* of time-based political activity (284).

Both the Rosenstone and Hansen study and the Brady, Verba and Schlozman study acknowledge the importance of groups. One of the most "social" characteristics of an individual is his or her membership in one or more organized groups. Group studies are important to political participation research because their findings suggest that those active in any organization are more likely to participate politically. (More specifically, this variable is important to our study because of the Gray Panthers subsample.) In addition, holding elected office with such a

group (which shows more commitment) and/or membership in organizations in which a relatively greater amount of political discussion takes place, serves as a stimulus to the more active or 'elite' forms of participation such as attendance at political rallies and events and making financial contributions to political parties, candidates and causes (Berelson et al., 1954; Maccoby, 1958; Verba and Nie, 1972; Cutler and Minns, 1977; Woodruff and Birren, 1983, 435).

Group theory offers many explanations for why this relationship exists. It suggests, most basically, that people join groups to fulfill certain uses and gratifications. Pluralist theory, for example, holds that rational, self-interested individuals with a mutual interest will form a group to promote that interest (Truman, 1951). Some suggest that people who join organizations are "participation prone," and would be politically active anyway. Verba and Nie's study attempts to separate the effects of organizational activity and participation by controlling for social and psychological factors that lead to participation. They tentatively conclude, "organizations do have an independent effect over and above any general propensity toward activity" (1972, 200). They find that what counts is "a combination of active membership and exposure to political stimuli [within that organization]" (1972, 199).

Rosenstone and Hansen point out that membership in groups causes people to be targeted by political leaders for

mobilization. "First, organization mobilize their own members, often explicitly.... In other cases, mobilization is more subtle. Members of bridge clubs, for example, are prone to political activism because they often talk politics over cards. Second, organizations expose their members to mobilization by sympathetic politicians, activists and other organizations... Finally, membership in organizations exposes people to social rewards. In voluntary associations, people are among friends, among people who share their interests and reward their participation in politics. Involvement in associations promotes political activism (1993, 83-84).

In a video tape containing an interview with six Panthers titled "*Making a Difference, Lifelong Political Activists*" (Cox, 1993), all six reflect on how important being a member of the Panther group is to them. They describe the "comradeship," "support for one another," "respect for one another," and "motivation" each gives to the other. They discuss the importance of "making a difference" and believe others who aren't involved are either "brainwashed by popular mythology," "too busy with the basic necessities of life," or "too self-absorbed." Their comments reflect the importance of group dynamics in sustaining activism.

Political Orientation Variables

Beyond the "social" environment in which we find ourselves, are factors which impact upon our participation but are more personal in nature. Although these "psychological" variables are heavily influenced by our social setting, they refer more specifically to the "pattern of traits characterizing an individual person" (Conway, 1991, 58). Psychological variables may include personality characteristics such as extroversion, internal locus of control, self-actualization, open-mindedness, dogmatism, and self-esteem. However, beyond personality, psychological involvement can also refer to "the possession of a complex structure of attitudes, beliefs and values with respect to some object" (Conway, 1991, 58). *Thus, more commonly studied by political scientists are the political components of psychological involvement which include: a perceived obligation to participate (civic duty), interest in politics, a sense of personal political effectiveness (political efficacy), and identification with a political party and/or political ideology.* These components are often grouped together under the heading "political variables."

We mentioned above that one problem with current research is its piecemeal approach to studying participation. Because so many variables are involved, any given study concentrates on just a few at a time. Thus, it is not surprising that the important recent work by both Rosenstone and Hansen, and also

Brady, Verba and Schlozman pays little attention to political variables as it concentrates on social/demographic "resource" variables. Rosenstone and Hansen include efficacy as a resource; Brady, Verba and Schlozman include political interest, but they largely ignore the remaining "political" variables due to the more limited nature of their explanatory models.

Thus, another reason this study does not replicate the Rosenstone and Hansen approach or the Brady, Verba and Schlozman approach, despite the usefulness of the "resource model," is that they are not inclusive enough. While we borrow the "resource variable" label, this study includes a variety of *both* social/demographic and political variables to get a more complete explanation of variation in the political behavior of seniors.

Political variables highly correlated with political engagement include: holding higher levels of civic duty, political interest, partisanship, ideology, political efficacy, and trust (Brody, 1978, 287-324; Sigelman *et al.*, 1985, 749-765). These variables are commonly used and cited in political participation/behavior literature. Rosenstone and Hansen describe the research to date as, "a mountain of empirical evidence" (1993, 141).

The civic duty variable reflects our sense of our responsibility as a citizen toward the political system. As originally construed it referred to a citizen's obligation to

vote. Campbell et al. (*The American Voter*, 1960) found that "wide currency in American society is given to the idea that the individual has a civic responsibility to vote." They found this sense of duty was increased as education level increased. Since then, the impact of civic duty on participation beyond voting has been studied but little relationship seems to exist.

Few would argue against the view that the greater the political interest, the greater the participation. Explanatory models vary only in the amount of participation they believe interest accounts for. Although interest will be discussed more fully below, it is interesting to note that in the recent study by Brady, Verba and Schlozman, they conclude that "because past work has not treated political interest as a possibly unreliable and endogenous measure, we believe that it has substantially underestimated the impact of interest and overestimated the direct impact of education (1995, 283).

Party identification refers to a psychological attachment or loyalty to a political party. It has been considered one of the most important determinants of electoral behavior since the publication of *The American Voter* (1960). Partisanship is distinguished from party identification because the former refers to the strength of party support. Rather than concentrating on the relationship between Democrats and participation, or Republicans and participation, studies such as the one conducted by Verba and Nie (1972) "fold" the party identification

scale and group strong supporters together, medium supporters together, weak supporters together, and leave independents alone (212).

By ideology, political scientists generally accept the definition offered by Campbell et al.: "A particularly elaborate, close-woven, and far-ranging structure of attitudes. By origin and usage its connotations are primarily political, although the scope of the structure is such that we expect an ideology to encompass content outside the political order as narrowly defined -- social and economic relationships, and even matters of religion, education and the like" (352-352). Like partisanship, studies often "fold" the ideology scale, creating a new scale in which extremists fall at one end and moderates at the other (212).

The usefulness of the efficacy variable was first suggested by Lane (1959) and became popular when cited by Campbell et al. (1960), and later by both Converse (1972) and Verba and Nie (1972). Campbell's team defined and operationalized "political efficacy" to "capture differences between individuals in a basic sense of control over the workings of the political system." They argued that "the politically efficacious individual feels that his vote counts in the operation of government and feels furthermore that there are reasonable ways in which he can influence the progress of the system beyond going to the polls" (516). Their findings became the basis for most subsequent

studies of political behavior. It was modified (in the 1970s) to reflect first, confidence in one's ability to understand politics and faith in one's capability to practice politics (internal efficacy), and second, belief in the influence of one's actions on the decisions of government (external efficacy) (Rosenstone and Hansen, 1993, 143).

Political cynicism and/or alienation is significant in that it is linked to reduced political behavior and apathy. In *Political Alienation and Political Behavior* (1973), Schwartz explains that alienation is a combination of personal inefficacy, system inefficacy, and basic value conflict with polity. For the truly alienated, beyond personal inefficacy, there is "a perceived value conflict between an individual's fundamental politicized values and those seen as represented by the polity; and a perceived systemic inefficiency such that the political system as a whole is seen to be thwarting and blocking the individual's value satisfaction, and no self-surrogate exists in the political system that can resolve the value conflict (that is, reform the alienating situation)" (94). (See Miller, 1974; Jennings and Niemi, 1975 and 1978.)

Thus, the remaining sections are each devoted to a further discussion of what the literature tells us about these potentially important determinants of political engagement. We group the variables into four subject areas: personal resources (*age, education, free time, health, and income*), social

involvement (group membership, marriage, senior center attendance, and years in the community), other demographics (gender, residence location and type of residence), and political orientation variables (civic duty, ideology, partisanship, political efficacy, political interest, and trust). Furthermore, we make predictions about the ability of these variables to explain variation in our dimensions of political engagement based on the evidence presented in prior research and logic.

THE VOTING ACTIVITY DIMENSION

According to Verba and Nie, authors of *Participation in America* (1972), senior citizens are predominantly "voting specialists." As such, most seniors, "vote regularly but do nothing else. They are low on political involvement and efficacy but not as low as inactives. They are more partisan than the average citizen but avoid taking sides in community conflict" (119).

Voting specialists are just one of six different "clusters" of participant types ranging from inactives to activists. Voting specialists fall just above inactives on their scale of political participation (Verba and Nie, 1972, 89-93). The usefulness of these types is called into question in Rosenstone

and Hansen's study. According to their findings: "some participants engage in several different political activities, but not to the point that they cluster in identifiable 'modes' of political participation" (1993, 45). Regardless of these findings, the point that most seniors do little other than voting is seldom disputed, because few citizens in any group do little more than vote (Rosenstone and Hansen, 1993, 128).

According to the following studies, the good predictors of voting are age, education, income, group membership, marriage, senior center attendance, years in the community, type of residence, civic duty, ideology, partisanship, political efficacy and interest. Among the least important are trust, gender and occupation. The predictive value of residence location is unclear.

Personal Resources

Studies suggest that voters come "disproportionately from the most advantaged sectors of society: from among wealthy, well-educated, white Americans" (Rosenstone and Hansen, 1993, 43). The first two of these characteristics fall under the category of personal resources. Most acknowledge that without time, energy, financial means, and transportation, participation of any kind is unlikely. It is precisely because seniors are the most likely group to combine all these resources that there is so much interest in their potential to be politically active.

Important work has been done to separate the effects of education, income and occupation, originally grouped together as the SES construct. As a result of these studies, education is widely believed to be the most important component of SES, influencing political participation of every kind (i.e. voting, campaign activity, organizational activity). Education not only increases political knowledge, it also works to develop certain social and cognitive skills required for political involvement, such as those skills necessary to take a leadership position in a political party, to run for office, or to understand complex political issues and form an opinion. Those who are more educated are also more likely to live in a social environment in which they feel pressure to be politically active (Wolfinger and Rosenstone, 1980; Almond and Verba, 1963; Brody, 1978; Conway, 1991, 23).

Within each educational level, the higher the income the greater the tendency to vote, though differences are small (Wolfinger and Rosenstone, 1980, 23). The effects of higher income are attributed to a variety of characteristics associated with individuals who succeed financially -- work environments that promote political participation in a number of ways, greater stakes in the government decisions concerning the collection and distribution of resources, and higher levels of activity and personal competence (Milbrath and Goel, 1977; DiPalma, 1970; Wolfinger and Rosenstone, 1980; Conway, 1991).

Once differences in participation attributable to education and income have been taken into account, few effects of occupation remain. Individuals with government jobs show greater interest and a greater tendency to vote, as do farmers with high stakes in government subsidy programs (Wolfinger and Rosenstone, 1980, 28-34). The seniors sampled in this study come from areas with high percentages of government workers, which may affect our findings by increasing their interest and tendency to participate -- at least as far as voting is concerned.

The picture is somewhat different when we consider the combined effects of age and education. One might speculate that because greater levels of education usually result in a greater tendency to participate, less educated seniors will participate less than more highly educated young people. To the contrary, however, Campbell's team (*The American Voter*, 1960) discovered that "increased turnout among older citizens is totally independent of education. In fact, it runs counter to the education factor, for the older generation has had considerably less formal education than the younger" (494). In other words, although seniors had typically received less formal education than younger age cohorts, in comparison, they still voted in greater numbers than younger groups no matter what their education level.

A decade later, Verba and Nie refuted the common perception that overall participation increased with age, peaked shortly

after 60, fell off, but never back to the low levels of the 20s and early 30s (1972, 144). Using statistical controls for education, income and length of residence in the community, they concluded that although political participation broadly defined gradually increases throughout the life cycle until age 65, and then gradually declines, voting did not decline even among the oldest group (147-8).

Recent studies support Verba and Nie and go one step further. For today's seniors, voting rates typically increase with age at least until they are into their eighties, and *within the senior population*, formal education is an important influence on voting (Cutler et al., 1984). Paul Abramson's findings in *Change and Continuity in the 1988 Election*, and Wolfinger and Rosenstone's analysis of census surveys, in *Who Votes* (1980) both suggest that low turnout among the elderly results primarily from their relatively low level of education in comparison with other seniors, not from considerations of gender and disengagement (Abramson, 1990, 99-100).

To see if these findings held true for another sample of seniors, the author created Figures 3.1 using ANES 1992 data. Figure 3.1 contains percentages, within the senior population, in terms of age, voting (in national elections) and education. As the literature suggested, we see that the percentage of those with graduate degrees who voted was much larger than those with

less than 12 years of schooling. Generally, the higher the education, the higher the voter participation.

FIGURE 3.1 PERCENTAGES¹ FOR AGE BY EDUCATION BY VOTER PARTICIPATION² IN 1992 (ANES DATA)

<i>Educ Level:</i>	<i>LT</i>		<i>13-15</i>	<i>BA</i>	<i>Graduate</i>	<i>N³</i>
	<i>HS</i>	<i>HS</i>	<i>yrs</i>	<i>equiv</i>	<i>Study</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
Age						
LT 30	23.8	51.6	75.2	88.0	88.9	305/189
31-40	20.7	64.3	86.8	91.6	96.2	426/141
41-50	39.5	83.5	79.5	91.8	95.3	289/ 69
51-60	60.0	77.1	95.2	94.3	94.1	228/ 47
61-70	70.4	89.1	93.3	95.8	100.0	205/ 37
71-80	66.2	76.8	91.2	92.9	100.0	142/ 40
GT 80	65.9	90.5	90.0	50.0 ⁴	100.0 ⁵	60/ 19

Notes:

1. Percentages computed by dividing number of those who voted by sum of those who voted plus those who did not for each cell.
2. Voter participation in the 1992 national election only. (ANES 1992 data)
3. N = raw numbers for that row: those who voted, those who did not.
4. 50% Of 2 people over 80 with a BA/BS degree, one voted, one did not.
5. 100% There was 1 person over 80 with an advanced degree -- s/he voted.

Despite this literature, the effects of education on this particular sample are likely to be minimal because so many are well-educated, especially the Panthers. Without a tremendous variation in our sample, between poorly and highly educated, other factors, such as group membership, are likely to emerge as more important determinants of participation. The same can be said for all three dimensions of political engagement.

The effect of health and free time on participation, particularly participation beyond voting, will be discussed in the next section. For the purposes of this section, the literature suggests that health has little independent effect on voting. Those who want to vote, do so, by absentee ballot if nothing else. As far as free time is concerned, while it may not increase the likelihood of activity beyond voting, logic suggests that it does allow people more opportunity to vote.

Social Involvement

Based on the view that "the better connected people are socially, the more likely they are to take part in electoral politics (Rosenstone and Hansen, 1993, 156)," variables often included in this context are the impact of one's spouse and friends, length of time in the community, and group membership.

Not surprisingly, a spouse can have a significant impact on participation. In general, married people are more likely to be involved in politics because the political activity of one inspires at least some political activity in the other. According to Wolfinger and Rosenstone, in *Who Votes* (1980), married people are more likely to vote than those who are single, separated, divorced or widowed. The effect is greatest among the old and uneducated. Even if someone has a weak

inclination to vote, a spouse with the same tendency will raise the probability that both will vote (44-46).

Length of time in the community also affects participation. Those who have not lived in a community for very long usually have fewer social and organizational ties, less information about local issues, fewer political contacts, and less interest and involvement in the local community. "Citizen participation increases markedly among persons who have lived in a community for three to five years" (Conway, 1991, 19-20). (See also Rosenstone and Hansen, 1993, 158.) This variable naturally affects all age groups, but in our case, we expect most individuals in our senior sample to have deep community ties, especially if they still live in a private residence.

Group membership is more closely related to participation beyond voting and is therefore discussed more fully in the next section. There is also a discussion of the relationship between senior center attendance and participation beyond voting. We can probably assume that if group membership and mobilization factors (such as peer pressure and transportation to political activities provided by many groups) increase activity beyond voting, they also increase voting for most.

Other Demographics

The "gender gap," a phrase coined by Campbell et al. in *The American Voter* (1960), refers to differences both in political behavior and orientations between men and women. They found that women voted 10% less than men, although the percentage decreased at higher levels of education (484). More recent studies have found this gap *has closed*. Susan Carroll (1989), for example, finds that since the Women's Movement, women's autonomy and feminist consciousness has increased (330-331). Women as a group have been voting as often as men since the early 1980s. Although women still try to persuade others less than men, the number of women engaging in this type of activity is growing (318). Like Carroll, Wolfinger and Rosenstone find virtually no differences in turnout between women and men until the age of forty, and find that demographic variables such as education and income account for nearly all differences in turnout between older men and women (1980, 42-43).

Some studies suggest that residence location -- urban versus rural -- is important but the evidence is contradictory. For example, in comparing an isolated city (autonomous political, social and economic unit) and small suburb, Verba and Nie concluded: "Participation in general and communal participation in particular are more widespread in more peripheral and isolated places. As one moves to the 'center' of society, such

activity is inhibited... This holds even for participation in national politics; suggesting a possible spill-over effect from activity on the local level" (Verba and Nie, 1973, 1973, 243). In a study of the political participation of elderly Hispanics, however, Torres-Gil found it greater among urban dwellers (Torres-Gil, 1976, 124). This could be due to the increased availability of public transportation for seniors in cities. If we go with the Torres-Gil findings which observed elderly citizens, urban dwellers vote more than rural residents.

The impact of the type of residence is discussed in the next section. Generally speaking, participation increases if individuals live in their own homes. This, in all likelihood, applies to voting as well.

Political Orientation Variables

Political variables highly correlated with voting include: holding higher levels of civic duty, political interest, trust, ideology, political efficacy and partisanship (Brody, 1978, 287-324; Sigelman et al., 1985, 749-765). The positive impact of a strong feeling of civic duty on participation has been documented since Campbell et al. (1960, 106). (See also Almond and Verba, 1965.) The strength of this belief has changed little over time. Reporting levels of belief in civic duty from 1952 to 1980, based on ANES data, Conway consistently found "between

45 and 49 percent of survey respondents indicated a high level of civic duty and 17 to 15 percent a low level" (1991, 43). These levels dropped in the 1980s, however, along with people's tendency to participate (Rosenstone and Hansen, 1993, 147). According to Rosenstone and Hansen, strong feelings of civic duty make a small impact on the probability of voting in presidential elections -- about six percent -- but they have no discernible effect on the probability of political activity beyond voting" (147).

The linear relationship between political interest (feelings of curiosity or concern about things political in nature) and participation is a logical one and has been well-documented. (See Berelson *et al.*, 1954; Campbell *et al.*, 1960; Riley and Foner, 1968; Glenn and Grimes, 1968; Glenn, 1969.) Hudson found a roughly linear relationship between age and political interest, although the greatest increases came more during the transition from youth to middle age than from middle age into old age (1976, 374).

There are numerous studies documenting the direct relationship between strong partisanship and greater political activity. As we mentioned above, studies usually "fold" the party identification scale in order to group party identifiers according to the strength of their support. According to Kavanaugh (1983), compared to nonidentifiers, strong party

identifiers are more likely to be "politically interested, informed, active, and likely to believe in the efficacy of the election process" (89). (See also Verba and Nie, 1972, 212.)

Like the scale associated with party identification, the scale associated with ideology ranging from extremely conservative to extremely liberal, is also often "folded" to give a better sense of an individual's strength of beliefs. The effect of ideology on participation, however, is not clear, but studies suggest that the more ideologically extreme, the more likely an individual is to participate.

Rosenstone and Hansen find that citizens with the greatest sense of internal efficacy (confidence in one's capability to practice politics) are about 2.9 percent more likely to vote, about 5.6 percent more likely to persuade, about 1.7 percent more likely to volunteer in campaigns, and about 2.5 percent more likely to contribute money than citizens with the least sense of their own competence. Similarly, people with the greatest sense of external efficacy (belief in the influence of one's actions on the decisions of government) are 10.6 percent more likely to turnout, 4.8 percent more likely to try and influence, 1.4 percent more likely to work for a party, and 2.8 percent more likely to give money than people with less confidence in the government's concern with their opinions (1993, 145).

We might speculate that seniors have had the most opportunity in terms of time to develop a high sense of at least internal efficacy. That is, they have had considerable time to develop confidence about their own beliefs and the courage to express their convictions to public officials. They have also had the most time to become disenchanted with the political system and may, in fact, have low external efficacy. According to Milbrath, however, age did not show a consistent relationship to a sense of efficacy (1965, 58). More recently, Miller also found that a significant portion of seniors felt inefficacious both as individuals and as members of their age group suggesting no relationship between age and efficacy (Miller *et al.*, 1980, 697).

According to Delli Carpini, in his study of the aging of 1960's liberals, *Stability and Change in American Politics* (1986), "aging has an independent effect on the development of most political attitudes, opinions, and behaviors. In general, as cohorts grow older, they become gradually more cynical about the political system" (1986, 323). In addition, according to Rosenstone and Hansen, "public trust in government and assessments of its responsiveness have both eroded spectacularly over the past four decades. In 1958, for example, 76 percent of the American public said they 'trusted the government to do what is right,' most of the time or always. In 1980, only 26 percent

did" (150). Although many observers blame the decline of political participation on decaying trust, Rosenstone and Hansen found little evidence to support it. "In both presidential and midterm years...neither feelings of trust in government nor beliefs about government responsiveness have any effect whatsoever on the likelihood that citizens will vote or will take part in any form of campaign politics" (150).

In sum

The literature suggests that as age, education and income increase, so does voting. Higher levels of group membership, marriage, spousal participation, and years in the community are also related to higher levels of voting. Living in a private residence should increase voting, and urban dwellers probably vote more than rural residents. High levels of civic duty, political interest, ideology, efficacy, and partisanship also increase the likelihood of voting. Health, gender and trust have little or no effect. Due to the nature of this sample, education and income will probably have little or no effect because the variation across the sample is low.

THE POLITICAL ACTIVITY DIMENSION

This dimension refers to *political activities beyond voting*. Few participate as the costs of political involvement increase. According to Rosenstone and Hansen, since 1952 (in presidential years), on average, "32 percent of the electorate have tried to influence how other people vote, but only 10 percent have contributed money to parties or candidates and just 4 percent have worked for campaigns" (1993, 42). Reflecting back on the continuity versus change debate discussed in Chapter Two, Rosenstone and Hansen find limited continuity in participation beyond voting. Analyzing two NES panel studies (one from 1956-1958-1960 and one from 1972-1974-1976) in which the NES interviewed the same respondents over a series of three elections, they find few who took part in one election did so in the next as well (53). They find stability in citizen participation is the *exception* not the rule: "One participant in three participates regularly; over two-thirds of the participants take part sporadically" (55). Their findings contradict our hypotheses drawn from socialization literature, which suggests instead that continuity dominates adult behavior. However, Rosenstone and Hansen add that participating in one election makes people more likely to participate in another (55).

It should also be noted that according to Rosenstone and Hansen, most participants take part in one or two political activities. These are generally overlapping activities that take similar kinds of skills, such as writing ability or verbal ability. They find party workers more apt to also attend rallies, while those with "verbal acuity" may be more inclined to make a speech and write letters (45).

Rather than repeat the variables discussed in the preceding section, this section assumes that those variables identified as important predictors of voting are also important predictors of political activity. For example, just as income was important to voting, wealthy Americans are more likely to take part in political activities than poor Americans. According to Rosenstone and Hansen, income allows people to bear the material costs of participation (134). Similarly, the most educated are over two times more likely to try to influence others and four times more likely to work for a campaign, sign petitions and attend public meetings (Rosenstone and Hansen, 1993, 45). Literature reviewed in this section suggests that good health, membership in groups that discuss politics, senior center attendance and a private residence are important determinants of political activity beyond voting.

Personal Resources

Beyond income and education, the combination of age and health is particularly important to this dimension because active participation requires the most energy and mobility. It seems natural to assume that the better one's health and physical mobility or "independence," the greater the likelihood of political participation if one is inclined to do so. Some studies, such as one by Torres-Gil referenced earlier (1976) assume that the age variable incorporates one's tendency toward good health. Other studies such as one by Ishii-Kuntz (concerning determinants of volunteering for women) include health status as a separate independent variable. Not surprisingly, she found "the healthier elderly women perceive themselves to be, the more likely they will be involved in voluntary organizations (1990, 91).

The health variable helps to explain why political activities beyond voting decline for individuals over sixty regardless of education level. A recent study by Jirovech and Erich (1992) points out that subgroups of seniors tend to participate in certain types of political activities. For example, affluent, healthy, and well-educated respondents were disproportionately represented among those making personal contact with politicians or helping to solve community problems.

For all respondents, ongoing political participation was generally lower than that reported for the past 25 years.

One circumstance of great interest to this study is the effect of retirement on political participation. Retirement ties in closely with other concerns such as a respondent's health and available free time. (See, for example, Jirovec and Erich, 1992.) Most studies on the effects of retirement are conducted in terms of continuity or change as discussed in the preceding chapter. Most conclude continuity is the rule for most seniors, despite the old stereotype about retirement -- that seniors take up hobbies and join clubs to fill their time.

In a study focusing on volunteering as a substitute for role loss in old age, Susan Chambre concludes, retirement does not appear to lead to a greater tendency for the respondents to become volunteers; those who are in the labor force are twice as likely as retirees to be volunteers (1984, 294). Chambre's findings agree with a 1981 National Council on the Aging study which found that employed elderly persons were more frequently volunteers but that, among volunteers, retirees spent more time doing volunteer work (1984, 294). (See also Morgan *et al.*, 1985.) Suzanne Kunkel finds "most people continue to engage in the same kinds of recreation after retirement as before" (1989, 58). Atchley summarizes several major studies and also

concludes that "only a small proportion of people take up entirely new activities following retirement" (1988, 210).

Social Involvement

Rosenstone and Hansen argue that involvement in associations promotes political activism. In both subtle and explicit ways, groups mobilize their members to act. In fact, they found that "*no variable in our cross-sectional analysis has a larger impact on the probability that people will participate*" (1993, 83-84, emphasis added). Comments by Panther members discussed earlier in this chapter reinforce this view.

Others have studied the relationship between attendance at senior centers and political activity. For example, in James Trela's study of the political consequences of senior center and other senior group memberships, he speculates that what holds true for group membership in general might also hold true for senior center participation and senior group memberships. Specifically, he tests the theory that "voluntary association members are more often politically active than nonmembers and tend to be oriented toward political affairs from the point of view of their group life" (1971, 118). Trela finds that although senior centers and groups offer an environment "propitious to socio-political discussion, ... [in fact] older people when associating with age peers do not engage in

persuasive debate which may involve the risk of devisiveness" (119). However, senior center/group members are more likely to participate in political activities (such as attending rallies, working in elections, and contributing money) than seniors who are not group members. Those who are not group members are most likely to have engaged in no political activities (120). Trella also discovers that participation in mixed generational groups exposes members to the perspectives of other generations and appears to "reduce the salience of age status as a political referent" (121). (See also Cutler, 1973; Ragan, 1974; Torres-Gil, 1976, 124.)

While years in the community tend to increase voting activity, Rosenstone and Hansen do not find a similar relationship between this variable and activity beyond voting. In presidential years, years in the community has "no detectable impact" on the likelihood that people will try to persuade others how to vote or donate money. In mid-term elections there is only a slightly greater likelihood that these actions will occur (1993, 159).

Other Demographics

Very recent studies concerning age and type of residence -- private versus nursing home versus retirement community -- suggest that we can expect more political activity from those

living in private dwellings (Hubbard, 1992; Heintz, 1976; Kastenbaum, 1993). Retirement communities and nursing homes create insular societies where seniors become increasingly self-absorbed. In addition, those able to maintain a private residence as a senior citizen are more likely to be healthy and active in mind and body, and are more likely to have access to transportation.

Political Orientation Variables

Returning to our discussion in the preceeding section, high levels of political interest, ideology, efficacy, and partisanship increase the likelihood not only of voting, but of activities beyond voting as well. Rosenstone and Hansen find civic duty unrelated to activity beyond voting. The trust variable is particularly important in this dimension if it is coupled with high efficacy, in which case a person with low trust is more likely to get involved in protest actions and perhaps other forms of political engagement as well, such as voting and letter writing (Peterson, 20). . . Because Gray Panthers are frequently involved in protest activity, it will be interesting to see how high they score on the trust variable. Peterson's (1990) findings suggest that their score will be low.

In sum

The literature suggests that as age, education, income, and good health increase, so does the likelihood of participation beyond voting. However, education and income will probably have little effect in this sample because there is not much variation on these indicators. Higher levels of group membership, being married, and spouse participation are also related to higher levels of activities beyond voting. Living in a private residence increases the chances of participation as does living in the city. High levels of political interest, ideology, efficacy, and partisanship also increase the likelihood of political activity. Civic duty, however, seems to be unrelated to activity beyond voting. Low trust increases the change of political activity when coupled with high efficacy. Retirement status does not increase one's likelihood of volunteering in new activities, but does increase the likelihood of a greater time commitment to activities engaged in before retirement. Many years in the community increases voting but not activity beyond voting. Sex has little or no effect on either dimension.

THE POLITICAL ATTENTION DIMENSION

As we mentioned earlier, attention to the audience in political communication literature has been primarily concerned with the impact of the media and mass communication on the attitudes and behavior of members of society. While the impact of the media on seniors is an interesting question in itself, it is not the subject of this study. Rather, we are interested in the relationship between the variables discussed at length in the previous two sections and this new dimension of political engagement. We can make some predictions based on what we know about their importance to the other two dimensions, the political communication literature discussed above, and general features of old age.

Personal Resources

Logic suggests that the greater the education, the greater the political attention. Higher levels of education are closely related to higher levels of political interest and as we mentioned above, we can assume that individuals don't read, listen or watch unless they are interested. (Unintended exposure is a possibility, especially in a nursing home, but this sample does not include nursing home residents.) In addition, as we mentioned earlier, the Bogart study of newspaper

readers finds newspapers have their greatest following among people of higher education and social status (1981, 54). However, for reasons discussed earlier, education will probably have little effect in this sample.

Income, by itself (even if we had more variation in our sample) should be of little importance since access to newspapers, a television and/or a radio is not difficult for most. Income should only matter as it relates to variables such as social status and education. But, as we saw with voting, *if those other variables are held constant*, it should not make any difference.

Health is important in a negative sense. The poorer one's health, the more likely one is confined to the house, or a room, and the more likely the need to "escape" through reading, watching or listening to the media. The motivation of "surveillance" might particularly apply here, since more active forms of surveillance are difficult.

The amount of free time a person enjoys has to do with factors such as health, the spouse, and other obligations. We can probably assume that if someone is politically interested, and has several hours of free time available on a daily basis, that he or she will use at least a portion of that time to stay informed. We expect that the greater the free time, the greater the attention.

Social Involvement

We expect group membership, frequent senior center attendance, years in the community, and a spouse's level of political attention may all act to increase political interest, and therefore political attention. The motivation "anticipated utility" seems to particularly apply to group members such as our Panther sample who are likely to discuss politics in the group setting, and would need facts to support their positions. Years in the community also increase not only the "anticipated utility" of information, but also the interest and excitement associated with that news. Bogart found married people are the most likely to be frequent newspaper readers, suggesting that interest is contagious (1981, 60).

Other Demographic Variables

Sex may be unrelated to attention in this dimension because we have so many highly educated women. The differences between sexes are larger for younger versus older men and women. While the Bogart study found women less likely than men to read the newspaper, reasons were primarily associated with the demands of working and childcare (1981, 71). Kohut and Owen (1995) found that generally speaking, women with high income and education have the same level of attention to politics as uneducated men with lower incomes. We can speculate that because the senior

women (in this study) do not have the constraints of childcare and working, and tend to be well-educated, they should be as likely as men to watch, read or listen to political shows. However, we can also speculate that if attention to the media is habitual or an acquired taste, and differences go beyond education and income, early habits could make a difference. We are more persuaded by the former than the latter and predict no difference between the sexes.

If an urban residence does in fact increase interest and activity, it will probably also increase attention primarily because of the relationship between interest and attention. Additional evidence is offered in the Bogart study. He found that the geographic region in which people live makes a significant impact on newspaper reading. People in the South and West are generally less frequent readers than people in the Eastern and Central states. He attributed this difference to lower levels of urbanization and education. Thus, while our entire study population falls within the "East," the level of urbanization does vary, and may impact on sample members.

Type of residence may also make a difference. Theoretically, someone in a retirement home might watch, read or listen more, but only if the television or radio is a personal, not communal one. However, more social involvement tends to increase interest, so people not living in institutions may be

more attentive. Thus, the direction of the relationship between living accommodations and attention is unknown.

Political Orientation Variables

The participation literature suggested that higher levels of civic duty, political interest, ideology, and partisanship prompted higher levels of voting and activity beyond voting. The same relationship seems likely between these variables and political attention. All suggest a deep level of interest in, and opinions about the political system, which might cause individuals to want to follow the news. While research on the motivations for avoiding television news suggested partisanship (and perhaps ideology as well) might not follow this general rule, increased partisanship and ideology might simply lead individuals to select news most in keeping with their views but not decrease the overall amount of news they follow.

The relationship between political efficacy and attention is unclear. We can speculate that because those who feel a greater ability to make a difference, and/or who feel the system is responsive are usually more interested and involved, that they will be more attentive. Conversely, those who don't feel efficacious may actually watch, listen or read more because the media is such a nonthreatening way in which to participate, or

simply withdraw their attention. Thus, the relationship is unknown.

Based on the motivation literature, trust may be negatively related. Those with little trust may be so alienated that they reject news about politics. If we find a relationship between high participation levels of the Panthers and high alienation levels, then according to this view, we should also see less attention to the media by Panthers than their peers.

Predicting Participation

Our goal in this chapter was to identify variables currently thought to have a strong relationship with different aspects of political engagement. Theoretically, a combination of the socialization variables identified in Chapter Two with some current participation variables, will allow us to both judge the relative merit of the socialization variables against the "tried and true" participation variables and, in terms of research question four, help us to better predict the political engagement of seniors.

Specifically, the literature (and in some cases logic, when gaps existed in the literature) suggests the following ***hypotheses*** in regards to relationships between the variables listed above and each dimension of political engagement:

FIGURE 3.2: HYPOTHESES BASED ON POLITICAL ENGAGEMENT LITERATURE

<u>Increases in the Variable (fr lo-hi)</u>	<u>Causes the following impact on Post-60</u>		
	<u>Voting</u>	<u>Activity</u>	<u>Attention</u>
<u>Personal Resources</u>			
age	increase	no change	increase
education	no change	no change	no change
free time	increase	no change	increase
health	no change	increase	decrease
income	no change	no change	no change
<u>Social Involvement</u>			
active spouse	increase	increase	increase
active friends	increase	increase	increase
group membership	increase	increase	increase
marriage (no to yes)	increase	increase	increase
senior center	increase	increase	increase
years in community	increase	no change	increase
<u>Other Demographics</u>			
gender	no change	no change	no change
rural to urban	increase	increase	increase
ret commun to private	increase	increase	unknown
<u>Political Orientation Variables</u>			
civic duty	increase	no change	increase
external efficacy	increase	increase	unknown
ideology (folded)	increase	increase	increase
internal efficacy	increase	increase	unknown
partisanship (folded)	increase	increase	increase
political activity			
- before sixty	increase	increase	increase
- after sixty	NA	increase	increase
political attention			
- before sixty	increase	increase	increase
- after sixty	increase	NA	increase
political interest			
- before sixty	increase	increase	increase
- after sixty	increase	increase	increase
trust	no change	no change	decrease
lo trust/hi efficacy	increase	increase	increase
voting			
- before sixty	increase	increase	increase
- after sixty	increase	increase	NA

The literature review summarized in the last two chapters provides us with several things. First, we have theoretical answers to the four research questions which concern continuity versus change, potentially important childhood socialization variables, and predicting levels of political engagement. Second, we have a set of hypotheses to test. And third, we have a body of literature from which to draw both the variables we want to use in our survey and the questions we need to measure them. Because this study is a quantitative one, considerable time and effort were devoted to its methodology. The next chapter discusses the methodology used to test these predictions. From there we proceed to a discussion of our findings.

CHAPTER 4: METHODS AND MEASURES

Since the onset of the "behavioral revolution" in the 1950s, many students of political science have emphasized the "scientific" aspect of political science in ways impossible before computers became widely available. While the goal of such research is understanding the behavior of groups of individuals, such patterns only emerge by aggregating their separate responses. Surveys have long been the most popular tool for acquiring this type of information (Babbie, 1986, 203). However, as Rosenstone and Hansen point out in *Mobilization, Participation and Democracy in America* (1993), "most of what we know about participation comes from [survey] studies of cross sections, from comparisons of individuals at a single moment, usually in a single election" (2). This approach to studying participation fails to adequately address factors influencing participation over the life span. A few longitudinal studies exist, as noted in the previous chapter, but a longitudinal study is usually beyond the time and resources available to those interested in researching political participation. Such is the case with this study.

The nature of the first three research questions addressed in this study requires a life span approach. Questions one and two concern continuity versus change over time, while question three concerns childhood socialization experiences. Lacking

the necessary resources to conduct a longitudinal study, the author created a methodology which attempts to combine the best of both techniques. While this study continues the long tradition of employing survey data to gather quantitative information about a senior population, it deviates from the norm by attempting to combine questions typically asked in a one-time, cross-sectional survey (which usually concentrates on the present, or recent past) with questions measuring variables which occurred earlier (in some cases, much earlier) in the life span. Admittedly, this method relies heavily on memory. Thus, the reliability of memory, particularly for seniors, is addressed early in this chapter. The first section of this chapter addresses fundamental questions:

- (1) Where will the data come from?*
- (2) How reliable are senior citizens' memories?*
- (3) What instrument, the self-administered or interview survey, is best suited to the goals of this study?*
- (4) How closely can we approximate a representative, random sample of seniors?*
- (5) How should we design the questionnaire?*
- (6) Can one measure change over time without a longitudinal study?*

The methodology assumes a questionnaire can tap the issues addressed by these fundamental questions if the results are interpreted with some caveats.

Once decisions were made regarding these central questions, most importantly the decision to collect my own data, it was possible to create and order a series of questions designed to measure the variables under consideration. The rest of the chapter addresses specifically how the survey was constructed, how variables included in the study survey were chosen and measured, how the data were collected, the computer program chosen for the data analysis, and a comparison of this sample with a more representative national sample.

Data Source: Mine or Theirs?

The nature of the questions suggested the best senior sample would be a national one. The most common source of data available on political participation is the American National Election Studies (ANES) conducted for the past 22 election cycles by the Center for Political Studies of the Institute for Social Research located at the University of Michigan. ANES studies provide data on political interest in election campaigns, political information, candidate and party evaluations, opinions, political participation, vote choice, political predispositions, social altruism, detailed demographic information and measures of religious affiliation and religiosity.

Unfortunately, ANES and other national studies like it, do not provide data on the subject of political engagement over the life span, nor do they ask childhood socialization questions.

However, ANES does provide an invaluable resource for some participation questions. Items used over several decades offer the advantage of having been tested for reliability over time, *and can be used as a comparison test to demonstrate the ways in which a small, local sample may be representative of the nation as whole.* Consequently, the data for this study needed to be obtained by the author herself. The next question became, how reliable would data collected from seniors actually be?

The Reliability of Memory

Recollection of personally experienced events is known as "autobiographical memory." Despite the problems associated with checking the accuracy of such memories, there have been a number of studies on this subject. (See, for example, Crovitz and Quina-Holland, 1976; Fitzgerald and Lawrence, 1984; and Rubin, 1986 for a review.) These studies generally find more recent events are recalled more easily regardless of age, although a U-shaped function has also been reported (MacKinnon and Squire, 1989; McCormack, 1979). The U-shaped function refers to the fact that often both remote and recent events are recalled more easily than intermediate ones. Rabbit and McInnis (1988) discovered that more intelligent seniors recall earlier memories from childhood than do less intelligent seniors (Kausler, 1991, 470-1). Sperbeck et al. (1986) found no relationship between age and the number of, or speed with which, memories were

retrieved. In sum, the literature demonstrates no clear pattern of adult age differences in the accessibility of personal memories (Rybash et al., 1986, 97).

In addition, the value of memory is too often ignored. As Gittins suggests in *"Oral History, Reliability and Recollection"* (1979): "The very process of selection in recollection provides in itself important historical data... what someone remembers can be a good indicator of what has been most important to that person over time" (141). DeWaele and Harre, authors of *Emerging Strategies in Social Psychological Research* (1979), add: "The individual's past is not a relic... Quite the contrary, it is part of the living present... what is remembered of it is inevitably subject to continuous modification... the past not only makes us, but we also make it by putting pieces together into a more or less coherent whole" (181-1). Thus, the individual helps the researcher by recalling the past, and the researcher helps the individual by taking those memories and giving them greater significance by placing them within a larger context.

All this is not to say that recollection data doesn't have its drawbacks; memory is an imperfect source of information. We know, for example, that autobiographical memories are revised continuously throughout the life course, with recall of previous events subject to reinterpretation as new events occur (Cohler, 1982; Whitbourne, 1985). Memories may be clouded by time, and any event, past or present, may be purposefully created to suit

the needs of the individual, but this limitation is not a unique problem of retrospective data, rather it is a problem common to all social science research (Andrews, 1991, 61). Thus, while autobiographical memory is an imperfect source of data, the literature does not suggest that seniors are any less trustworthy than a younger sample in providing necessary retrospective information.

Sampling Seniors

Ideally, the nature of the questions asked, and the demands of scientific research require, a perfectly random and representative sample. That is, all members of the (in this case, senior) population have an equal chance of being selected in the sample (Babbie, 1986, 141).

Available resources, however, dictated a small, local sample. Literature reviewed in Chapter Three indicated residence location might be an important determinant of participation, but the evidence was contradictory. One suggested urban residents were more active; another suggested rural residents were more active. Therefore, a conscious choice was made to reach both urban and rural seniors. An effort was also made to reach seniors representing the full spectrum of political activity levels, and seniors from white, African-American, Asian and Hispanic backgrounds.

The Gray Panthers were selected as the most political and most accessible group of senior citizen activists in the local area. Discussions with staff members at its national headquarters in Washington D.C. and with area "conveners" (another word for group president or chairperson) led to an agreement whereby the conveners allowed limited access to members of their respective "networks."

Self-Administered Questionnaire or Interview?

Two common types of survey research include the self-administered where respondents read questionnaires and enter their own answers, and the interview where the interviewer personally asks questions orally and records the answers. According to Earl Babbie in *The Practice of Social Research* (1986, Ch 9), both of these types of surveying offer important advantages and disadvantages. Self-administered surveys are cheaper and quicker. They are easier to administer because they are less time consuming for both the researcher and respondent, and the answers to survey questions are easier to code and tabulate. Self-administered surveys are less threatening to the respondent because face to face contact with the researcher is not necessary, and thus, are better at dealing with sensitive issues. The resulting anonymity, in addition to the fact that surveys filled out at home are taken at a person's leisure, theoretically lead to more factual answers. Ease of

administration also allows an individual researcher (with limited funds) to reach a larger number of respondents than normally possible using the in-depth interview technique. Unfortunately, self-administered surveys do not allow the researcher to follow-up on interesting answers or probe for details. Surveys mailed to respondents are often not returned or returned incomplete.

While self-administered questionnaire data is often predominantly shallow, interviews offer the advantage of going beneath the surface and really exploring connections, causes and consequences. Interview surveys also produce fewer incomplete questionnaires, and are more effective at dealing with complicated issues. In addition, interviewers are able to make important observations while conducting the interview. Despite these advantages, interviews are also extremely time consuming for both the researcher and respondent. Individuals, especially busy ones, willing to fill out a survey, often balk at the time, effort, and greater invasion of privacy usually required in personal interviews. (Many seniors, for example, when spoken to on the phone, agreed to fill out a survey reluctantly because of the time involved and mentioned that they were too busy for a follow-up interview.) Because of these constraints, many studies employing the interview technique (unless heavily funded, and a team effort) concentrate on only a few subjects. For example, Andrews' study of British socialist activists

between the ages of 70 and 90, in *Lifetimes of Commitment: Aging, Politics and Psychology* (1991), spanned two years and concerned only fifteen white activists. Though interesting, her ability to generalize beyond her sample was virtually nonexistent.

Beyond these constraints, another factor contributed to the choice of a self-administered questionnaire. Since the goal of research questions three and four is to use socialization variables to better predict senior political activity, one way to do that is to use multivariate statistical analysis. Thus, we needed a large enough sample to satisfy the conditions of the statistical models we employed. This goal precluded exclusive use of the interview technique.

Thus, although depth was sacrificed, the self-administered questionnaire was chosen to reach a larger number of people, to reach those very politically active seniors who would have rejected the interview as too time consuming, and because it was better suited to sensitive questions concerning variables such as income, class, and socialization experiences.

However, efforts were made to avoid one of the major hazards of this technique, namely failure to return the survey. All respondents who were sent a survey in the mail, were provided with a self-addressed, stamped envelope. These respondents knew the survey was coming before it was sent and

had verbally agreed to fill it out. All other respondents received the survey in person.

Questionnaire Design

Following guidelines suggested by Babbie in *The Practice of Social Research* (1986, 204-220), the questionnaire was designed to be as uncluttered as possible.¹ The ordering of questions was carefully considered. Questions concerning change over time were first, because they were fairly easy, non-threatening, and central to the study topic. Demographic variables were spread throughout the survey, the more sensitive ones such as income saved until late in the survey. Socialization questions, many of which were highly sensitive, were placed at the end of the survey.²

Change Over Time

As discussed earlier in Chapter Two, actually measuring activity levels over time is extremely difficult. Under ideal conditions, available perhaps in a longitudinal study, one is able to note the position of some variable at a given point in time and calculate change in that position at some later time. Unfortunately, for a study like this one, no earlier data are available except that provided by the individual being surveyed. The literature suggests we can trust those data up to a point,

but how can we best measure information about change in political orientations?

Some critics point out that many researchers often simply compare levels of participation instead of looking at continuity of a particular activity. (See, for example, Fox, 1982; Chambre, 1984.) In other words, researchers compare the sum of a person's various types of activity in the past with the sum of activity in the present. However, as Jankowski and Strate argue, "there are no clear theoretical reasons why age should have an identical effect on each of the different modes of political participation...It seems likely that the impact of various age-related processes and statuses would vary across modes of participation" (1995, 92). This study followed Jankowski and Strate's lead by looking at change and/or continuity as it related to many separate political activities and tries to determine the direction of change when it occurs. Measurement techniques are discussed more fully below.

Jankowski and Strate solve the problem of measuring the impact of various age-related processes and statuses across modes of participation by using a series of ANES cross-sectional surveys, but their methodology ignores the importance of change versus continuity as it applies to the same individual over time. From their data they are not able to determine, as this study hopes to, the value of previous aspects of political

participation in predicting present levels of those same aspects of political participation.

Variable Measurement

(For a complete list and description of variables, see the Appendix.)

Research Question 1: Can we characterize the political engagement of seniors as one of change or continuity over the life course?

To best answer this question we need to be able to compare various aspects of political engagement before senior citizen status and after. We need to measure change for each aspect of engagement, theorizing that some activities increase while others decrease, and so forth. The results of these measurements are used first to measure change over the lifespan, and second to create political participation dependent variables (political activity, political attention, and voting). It would have been desirable to know the level of various aspects of political participation at specific ages throughout the life course, but such an approach was unfeasible for reasons of time, confusion, and memory for detail.

Since we want to compare the level of past activity with present activity, a simple before and after approach is used to capture the essence of change over time. No matter what the age of the seniors being surveyed, they are simply asked the level

of engagement before 60 versus after 60.³ This approach minimizes confusion, and allows room for other types of questions in the survey. *It is assumed that seniors can recall the highest level they achieved with respect to various political activities.* They can be expected to remember whether they did something always, frequently, occasionally, seldom, or never. This makes the surveying instrument manageable for the individual at the expense of more precise data for the researcher.

We are interested in both the attention related and more active aspects of political engagement. Activities pertaining to the attention dimension chosen for this study include: watching television news [TVNEWS]; watching television political shows such as McNeil-Lehrer [TVSHOW]; reading political news in papers and/or magazines [READ]; and listening to political talk radio [LISTEN].

To measure active aspects of political engagement, questions suggested by the ANES survey are used. These questions include: voting in local and/or state elections [VOTLOC]; voting in primaries and/or caucuses [VOTPRI]; voting in national elections [VOTNAT]; attending political meetings or rallies [MEETING]; working with others to solve community problems [COMPROB]; personally contacting politicians [CONTACT]; working in election campaigns [WORK]; contributing money to parties, candidates, and/or causes [MONEY]; demonstrating on behalf of a particular cause [PROTEST]. The variable for an activity such

as contributing money before sixty is labeled "MONEY1," after sixty, "MONEY2."

The sum of the four *before sixty* attention variables [TVNEWS1, TVSHOW1, READ1, LISTEN1] creates a new variable called political attention before sixty [POLATTN1]; the four *after sixty* [TVNEWS2, TVSHOW2, READ2, LISTEN2] variables combine to form [POLATTN2]. Composite variables for political activity before and after sixty [POLACT1, POLACT2] and voting before and after sixty are created in the same way.⁴ *The political activity, political attention, and voting constructs are referred to in the remainder of this paper as **engagement dimension variables**.*

Research Question 2: If we see change, is it in the direction of more or less involvement?

Using data collected to answer question one, question two suggests a comparison of frequencies of activity before and after senior status (age sixty) suffices to answer this question. We need to measure change in such a way that we note no change, more frequency and less frequency in levels of political engagement. Once these aspects of change are recorded we can compare the direction of change in the aggregate for each dimension of political engagement.

In addition to questions measuring levels of political engagement before and after sixty, respondents are similarly

asked to rate levels of political interest *both before and after* sixty [POLINT1, POLINT2] on the same 1 to 5 scale. Levels of organizational involvement are measured by asking about group membership [GPMBR1 and GPMBR2] and whether or not respondents held elected positions *both before and after 60* [GPLDR1 and GPLDR2]. The sum of these four group variables creates the construct variable [GROUP].

A change variable is created for each of the above variables (participation, interest and group membership); coded 0 for no change, 1 for less frequently, and 2 for more frequently. In comparing VOTNAT1 with VOTNAT2, for example, change in the frequency of voting is labelled [CHVOTNAT].

Research Question 3: How do the childhood socialization experiences of highly politically engaged seniors compare with the childhood socialization experiences of less politically engaged seniors?

Socialization literature suggests that some parental behaviors increase the potential for political activity as an adult while other behaviors decrease one's potential for future political activity. Specifically, important determinants of future political or prosocial behavior seem to include: authoritative parenting, a pluralistic home environment, altruistic/politically active role modeling, emphasis on

religion, early assumption of responsibility, and parental partisanship.

To measure one aspect of role modeling that would seem to have the most direct impact on the future political engagement levels of children, a question is included concerning the political engagement levels of parents. It is similar to the one asked to the respondents themselves: "When you were growing up did your mother (father) engage in any of the following activities frequently/always?" Respondents are asked to circle all of the following that apply: "read political news [READ]; voted [VOTE]; attended political meetings or rallies [MTGS]; worked with others to solve community problems [PROBS]; personally contacted politicians [CONT]; worked in election campaigns [WORK]; contributed money to parties, candidates, causes [MONEY]; or demonstrated on behalf of a particular cause" [PROT]. (A prefix "MOM" or "DAD" indicated who the variable referred to, i.e. MOMREAD.) Television was not included for reasons discussed in Chapters One and Two.

In a similar vein, the Oliner study suggests other aspects of role modeling that might be important to future prosocial behavior. Consequently parental religiosity is touched on, as is parental volunteer activity. The survey asks the following questions in this regard: (1) "Were either of your parents deeply religious?" [PARSREL] (2) "Did you attend religious

services regularly as a child?" [MASSREG] and (3) "Did your parents volunteer when you were growing up?" [PARSVOL].

Following up on an old study of sibling pairs conducted by Hess and Torney (referenced in Chapter Two), particularly their finding that "having active and powerful male role models is important in the development of active political involvement (particularly for boys)," this study borrows their power question (1967, 193). Two power variables exist, one for the mother and one for the father, based on the following: "Using the following scale, [from 1 "yes anyone," to 6 "almost no one"] do you remember your mother (father) as someone who could make anyone do what she (he) wanted them to do?" [POWERMOM, POWERDAD].

Chaffee Variables

The two dimensional approach suggested by Chaffee *et al.*, concerning family communication patterns, is measured with questions taken directly from their study. For each of their questions they allowed their respondents answers ranging from 1 to 4 where 1=never, 2=rarely, 3=sometimes, and 4=often. Their "socio-scale" is constructed from five questions: My parents encouraged me...(1) "to show anger in group situations," [ANGER] (2) "to challenge parental opinions," [CHALPARS] (3) "to argue with those older and more experienced," [ARGUE] (4) "to keep out

of trouble by avoiding conflict," [AVOIDCON] and (5) "to give in on arguments, rather than make someone mad" [GIVEIN].

Their "concept-scale" is constructed from six questions: "My parents encouraged me...(1) "to get my ideas across, no matter what others said," [EXPRESS] (2) "to look at both sides of an issue," [TWO SIDES] (3) "to participate in family discussions about politics," [DISCUSS] (4) "to participate in family decisions," [DECIDE] (5) "My parents took a side they didn't believe in, for the sake of argument," [DEVADV] and (6) "My parents visited people who took the other side in arguments about politics or religion" [VISIT].

In addition, a construct called political communication [POLCOMM] is the sum of five highly correlated variables all having to do with the childhood communication environment: arguing with elders [ARGUE], participating in family discussions [DISCUSS], expressing opinions [EXPRESS], politics frequently discussed in the home [PSCOM1], and visiting people who had different views [VISIT].⁵

Along these same lines, an additional question: "My parents encouraged me to participate in family decisions," [DECIDE] is added to the Chaffee series but intended for use under family patterns, as is the following: "When you did something wrong, what was the usual response?" [PUNISH] (used to measure parental discipline practices).

Baumrind Variables

A large set of questions is designed to measure the nature of the home environment in terms of patterns of child-rearing practices. Baumrind's (1967, 1973) differentiation among permissive, authoritarian, and authoritative home environments suggests that respondents be asked to describe their relationship with each parent. With that in mind, respondents are presented with a list of adjectives. They are first asked to indicate which adjectives best describe the overall nature of their relationship with each parent and second, which adjectives best describe the relationship between their parents. Adjectives include: happy [HAPPY], angry/irritable [ANGRY], supportive/encouraging [SUPPORT], nagging/stressful [NAG], honest/open/trusting [OPEN], secretive/distrustful [SECRET], stern/strict/controlling [STERN], permissive [LAX], cold/harsh/distant [COLD], warm/loving/kind [WARM], demanding (high expectations) [DEMAND], indifferent [INDIFF], predictable/consistent [SAME], unpredictable/inconsistent [NOTSAME], violent/abusive/threatening [VIOLENT], independent [INDEP], and overprotective [OVERPRO].⁶

The Baumrind typology suggests variables be factored into four dimensions representing nurturance, responsibility, control, and communication. Accordingly, the nurturance scale [PARSWARM] is the sum of a happy, supportive, open and warm relationship with the mother and father. Responsibility is

measured using a question asking the age at which the respondent "started taking on adult responsibilities" [RESPON]. The control scale [PCONTROL] is the sum of variables measuring how stern, demanding and permissive both parents were. Communication is measured using the political communication construct [POLCOMM].

Research Question 4: Which of the characteristics we are studying are the most important in distinguishing between the most engaged and the least?

If the socialization variables are good predictors, they should be able to "hold their own" in multivariate regression analysis against the more well documented participation variables currently recognized in the political science discipline. Consequently, this study is designed not only to explore the relationship between socialization variables and senior political activity but also to compare their worth against some of the well known participation variables discussed in the literature. Therefore, both types of variables are included in the survey.

Research findings suggest that several of the best predictors of participation in general are as follows: age, education, income, years in community, residence and group membership factors, marriage, civic duty, political interest, political efficacy and partisanship, health, and senior center

attendance. The literature is not as clear on the effects of variables such as trust, ideology, class, and residence location, and discourages use of sex, occupation, or retirement.

Party identification [PID] and ideology [POLVIEW] are measured using the standard ANES seven point scales. Respondents are asked "If you had to place yourself on a scale from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong Democrat and 7 indicating strong Republican, where would you place yourself?" To allow alternate party responses, respondents were allowed to circle number 8 on the scale [OTHERPID], or number 9 for none or don't know. The same question is used to measure parent party identification [PIDMOM, PIDDAD].

Similarly, ideology for the parents of respondents is measured using the standard ANES seven point scale. Respondents are asked, "If you had to place your mother (father) on a scale from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating extremely liberal and 7 extremely conservative, where would you place her (him)?"

[PVMOM, PVDAD] Ideology for the respondents themselves is measured with a slight difference. Respondents are asked, "In general, before age 60, where would you have placed yourself on the following scale?" [POLVIEW] The scale extends from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating extremely liberal and 7 indicating extremely conservative. The follow-up question is designed to measure change in ideology by asking, "In general, compared to your answer to E5, since age 60, are you more liberal than you used

to be, more conservative than you used to be, or about the same?" [CHPOLVIEW]

The two efficacy variables (internal and external) and civic duty are measured using standard ANES questions. The questions for all three variables offer the respondent a choice of five answers ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. The scale constructed to measure internal efficacy [INTEFF] is the sum of the answers to three questions: (1) "Voting is the only way people like me can have any say about how the government runs things," [VOTEONLY] (2) "People like me don't have any say about what the government does," [NOSAY] and (3) "Often, politics and government seem so complicated a person like me can't understand what's going on" [COMPLEX].

Similarly, external efficacy [EXTEFF] is based on three questions: (1) "Public officials care about what people like me think," [POLSCARE] (2) "Generally, our representatives in Congress lose touch with the people pretty quickly," [LUZTOUCH] and (3) "Politicians are only interested in people's votes not their opinions" [POLVOTES].

Civic duty [CDUTY] is measured using five questions: (1) "So many other people vote in the national elections that it doesn't matter much to me whether I vote or not," [NOMATTER] (2) "If a person doesn't care how an election comes out then that person shouldn't vote in it," [NOCARE] (3) "It isn't important to vote when your party doesn't have any chance to win," [NOWIN]

(4) "A good many local elections aren't important enough to bother with," [NOLOCAL] and (5) "Citizens of this country have a duty to vote" [VOTEDUTY].

The trust [TRUST] variable is measured by using a series of ANES questions which all began, "Generally, I have faith and confidence in the following to do what's right for those they represent." This survey then lists "political parties [TRUSTPP], the Supreme Court [TRUSTSC], Congress as a whole [TRUSTCON], the President [TRUSTPZ], state government [TRUSTSG], local government [TRUSTLG], my State Senators and Representatives in Congress [TRUSTREP], and none of the above [NOTRUST]," and asks respondents to circle those they trust. The variable trust is the sum of those circled.

Several religion questions are included because they dovetail nicely with the religiosity questions included for socialization variable purposes. They include: "What, if any, is your religious preference now?" [DENOMNOW] and "How important is God in your life?" [GODIMPT]

(For most of the socialization and participation questions there is a "don't know" or "not applicable" or "none of the above" option for respondents.)

Data Collection

A survey (see Appendix), designed by the author, was administered to three groups of seniors: those residing in Arlington County, Virginia; those residing in St Mary's County, Maryland; and senior members of the Gray Panthers residing throughout the Washington Metropolitan area. The goal was roughly 300 surveys; approximately 100 surveys from each group of seniors. In fact, 319 surveys were completed sufficiently to code: 120 from Arlington County seniors, 99 from St Mary's County seniors, and 100 from Gray Panthers. The final survey was the result of two pretests.⁷

Arlington County is a suburban community minutes from the heart of urban Washington D.C. It is a very small county, comprising only 26 square miles but it is densely populated. Only one farm lies within its borders. According to census data, its population was roughly 170,000 in 1992. Of that 170,000, 75 percent were Caucasian, 11 percent African-American, and 14 percent Hispanic. Approximately 10 percent were receiving Social Security benefits (and were, roughly speaking eligible for this study).

The majority of Arlington County residents are well educated and well paid. Eighty-seven and a half percent of those persons over 25 have at least a high school degree, and 52.3 percent have at least a Bachelor's. The median family

income is \$55,356. Ten percent of its households earn less than \$15,000 per year. Forty percent of the residents of Arlington County are local, state or federal government employees. Another 11 percent are veterans. In the 1992 election, of the 82,000 citizens who cast votes for the president, 58 percent voted Democrat, 32 percent voted Republican, and 10 percent voted for Perot (Census, 579-591).

A random sample was considered unfeasible as voter registration lists are not available to the general public, and a survey mailed to a random set of addresses was cost prohibitive. Based on limited financial resources, the author chose to solicit responses from a wide variety of residents in Arlington County through an appeal in a newsletter produced by its Department of Recreation (with distribution to 5000 county seniors), to place surveys in nine county-run and church-run senior centers, and to personally solicit responses from seniors attending AARP and United Seniors meetings in Arlington.⁸ In many cases, directors of senior centers offered to encourage seniors to participate and assist them in filling it out when necessary.

Efforts to reach African-American, Hispanic, and Asian seniors were unsuccessful. Verbal and written appeals made little impact. The county newsletter reached all seniors, regardless of race or ethnic background. Surveys were placed in centers located in a variety of neighborhoods. De facto

segregation has resulted in centers which seem to cater to one group or another. Factors such as my race, the education level of the seniors involved, and language barriers may have contributed to the fact that few seniors responded to the survey other than whites.

St Mary's County is a rural county located approximately sixty miles south of Washington D.C. It lies just outside of what the census considers the "Washington-Baltimore Metropolitan Area" (Census, B-16). Seniors there are an interesting mix primarily of lifetime county residents and military retirees from Patuxent River Naval Air Station located in the heart of the county. Demographically speaking, St Mary's County is a medium sized county, comprising 361 square miles, more sparsely populated than Arlington. 754 farms comprise 80,000 acres. According to census data, its population was roughly 80,000 in 1992. Of that 80,000, 80 percent were Caucasian, 12.5 percent African-American, and 1.5 percent Hispanic. Approximately 9 percent were receiving Social Security benefits.

In terms of education and income, the numbers for St Mary's County are not as high as those in Arlington County. In St Mary's, 77.1 percent of those persons over 25 have at least a high school degree, and 17 percent have at least a Bachelor's degree. The median family income is \$40,828, but the cost of living is not much lower than that in Arlington County. Thirteen percent of its households earn less than \$15,000 per

year. Because of the navy base, 14 percent of the residents of St Mary's County are either local, state or federal government employees. Another 12.5 percent are veterans. In the 1992 election, of the 25,000 citizens who cast votes for the president, 36 percent voted Democrat, 46 percent voted Republican, and 18 percent voted for Perot (Census, 256-269).

Like procedures used in Arlington County, surveys were placed in county senior centers and church centers. Again, center directors offered to encourage seniors to participate and assist them in filling it out when necessary. Again, a conscious effort was made to reach out particularly to African-Americans. (Few ethnic minority groups are represented in the county.) Center representatives attributed the lack of response of African-Americans primarily to the education level and high illiteracy rate of the seniors involved.

The Gray Panthers were selected as the most political and most accessible group of senior citizen activists in the local area. There are three "networks" of Gray Panthers in the Washington D.C. area: one primarily comprised of Montgomery County, Maryland, residents, one of Prince George's County, Maryland, residents and one of District of Columbia residents. Each is run by a convener, and each is dominated by a small, core group of volunteers who are the most politically active on a daily basis. Beyond the core lies a group of less active members who participate as time, energy and interest permits.

The survey was administered to all three conveners, all core members (about seven in each network) and as many on a list of 30-40 less active members as possible. (Conveners provided the lists, compiled from their own group mailing lists. Entire mailing lists were not made available for privacy reasons.) Each Gray Panther was called, the project discussed, and permission granted, before a survey was sent. Of those who agreed, only a few failed to return the survey. Those who failed to return it were generally "too busy." One died before receiving the survey in the mail. The total membership list of the Prince George's County network was only thirty, so all members were surveyed.

A full range of Gray Panther members combined with the wide range of non-Gray Panthers created a total sample of approximately 300 seniors in which respondents represented the full spectrum of activity levels.

Data Analysis

SPSS for Windows was chosen to run the statistics for this study because it was readily available, "user-friendly," and possessed the capability to compute most of the information necessary. For the small amount of statistics using 1992 ANES data, the DOS SPSS program available on the Georgetown University mainframe was used.

Comparing ANES and Study Samples

To determine how much the study sample mirrors a more representative, national sample, this section compares study sample to the 1992 ANES senior sample in terms of a variety of similar variables. We find the study sample most closely matches the ANES sample in regard to the age and gender variables. If we exclude the Gray Panther subsample, the study sample also resembles the ANES sample closely in regard to party identification. The overall study sample differs most dramatically from the ANES sample in terms of education and religion. There are also significant differences in the variables income and ideology. By including subsample figures in this first set of comparisons we also see in what ways the Gray Panther sample and two county samples resemble and differ from the general population.

The 1992 ANES Sample

The 1992 ANES data was specifically chosen because as the most current ANES survey data available, at least theoretically, the senior members of its sample are the most similar to the seniors sampled in this study. Unfortunately, not all of what are considered "standard" ANES questions are included in the 1992 survey. However, enough were present to make comparisons with this study possible.

Tables comparing the 1992 senior sample to this study's senior sample are located in the Appendix. The data presented in those tables are discussed below. Of the 2487 individuals sampled in the 1992 ANES survey, 592 are over 60 years old. Of the 319 individuals sampled in this study (all over 60), 120 are Arlington County residents, 99 are St Mary's County residents and 100 are members of the Gray Panthers. We compared the ANES sample against the study sample as a whole, and in some cases, the subsamples as well. Subsample percentages are included to both illustrate important differences between our subsamples, and also because comparing the ANES sample percentages to only the overall study sample percentages is sometimes misleading. For example, Arlington County residents may be very similar to the national sample, but because the Gray Panthers are at times so different from the national sample, their subsample may make the overall study sample percentages for a particular variable much different from the ANES sample.

The Age Variable

The study sample resembles seniors in the ANES sample most closely in regard to the age and gender variables. The ANES senior sample includes: 49 percent 61-70 years old, 36 percent 71-80 years old, and 16 percent over 80. This study's senior sample includes: 33 percent 61-70 years old, 49 percent 71-80 years old, and 18 percent over 80. Thus, while the ANES sample

includes more 61-70 years old, this study includes more 71-80 years old but the percentages for over 81 are almost identical. Having the highest number in the mid-range is good for this study because it allows more opportunity for the possibility of change after 60, but means that most still have the physical resources to participate if they want to.

The Sex Variable

This sample resembles seniors in the ANES sample closely in regard to the sex variable. The ANES senior sample includes 38 percent men and 62 percent women. This study's sample includes a slightly higher percentage of women -- 70 percent women to 30 percent men -- due to the fact that the Arlington County and Gray Panther samples had more women than the national sample.

The Race Variable

The difficulties encountered in surveying both African-Americans and other types of minority groups resulted in three samples all almost exclusively comprised of senior whites. Even the Gray Panther sample reflects this bias because so few of its members represent minority groups. Therefore, this study can claim to represent (in a limited way) only senior whites in its findings.

The Education Variable

The differences between the ANES sample and the study samples become most apparent over the highest level of education achieved. The differences are consistent with the census data which indicated that Arlington County and St Mary's County residents are, as a whole, well educated. Approximately 70 percent of the ANES senior sample has no higher than a High School education. Only 14 percent of this study's total sample fit this same category. Another 24 percent of the ANES senior population has at least some college in comparison to 55 percent of the study population. Most strikingly, 6 percent of the ANES sample has education past college, while 37 percent of the study sample has attended graduate school. The Gray Panther subsample helps to explain this disparity. *Over 50 percent of its members have education beyond college.*

The Income Variable

Just as the study sample is better educated, it is also better paid than the ANES sample. Approximately 70 percent of the ANES senior sample makes less than 30,000 dollars a year, as opposed to just over 30 percent of the study sample in this category. The largest group of study seniors (37 percent) make between \$30,000 and \$50,000, although another large portion (23 percent) make between \$50,000 and \$75,000. The percentages making over \$75,000 (5 percent versus 8 percent are roughly

similar. While Panthers were the most well educated, they were not the most well-off financially.

The Religion Variable

The religion variable also reveals some surprising differences in the two populations. At least according to data in the ANES religion summary variable, its senior sample is almost exclusively Protestant or Catholic, with Protestants outnumbering Catholics two to one (68 percent Protestant, 29 percent Catholic). Very few are Jewish (3 percent) or affiliated with any other religious denomination. No one in the ANES survey falls into the "other" or "no religious affiliation" categories, although there are 63 missing observations. Some of those who declined to answer may very well have fallen into these two categories.

In comparison the study sample has 24 percent with no religious affiliation at all, 36 percent Protestant, 19 percent Catholic, 9 percent Jewish, and 10 percent Unitarian. The Panther sample skews the overall sample percentages significantly. *Almost half* (42 percent) of the Gray Panthers claim no religious affiliation. Of the remaining 58 percent, there are roughly the same percentages of Protestants (19 percent), Jews (18 percent) and Unitarians (15 percent).

The Party Identification Variable

Beyond comparisons involving social/demographic characteristics, we are also interested in comparisons more political in nature. A comparison of self-described party identification labels is a good first start.

A comparison of the ANES senior sample and the overall study sample shows rough similarity at first glance. Indeed, the level of Democrats in the ANES sample and the two county samples is virtually identical (roughly 45 percent). The larger number of Republicans in the county samples (roughly 40 percent Republicans, 15 percent Independents) is matched by a larger number of Independents in the ANES sample (roughly 30 percent for both Republicans and Independents). The larger number of Republicans in the county samples is matched by a larger number of Independents in the ANES sample. The Gray Panthers, however, are remarkably different, and skew the overall sample numbers. Seventy-five percent of the Gray Panthers are Democrats, 18 percent Independent, and 2 percent Republican, and a surprising 5 percent call themselves Socialists. Numbers of self-described ANES Socialists were not available, however, we can probably assume the percentage was lower than in our Gray Panther sample.

The Ideology Variable

Generally speaking, comparing the ideology variable across samples tells us the following. While the ANES sample is largely conservative (61 percent) to moderate (11 percent), the study sample is more evenly divided as a whole. Half are self-described liberals (51 percent), and the remainder are divided evenly between moderate (25 percent) and conservative (25 percent). The Arlington county sample is more liberal than the St Mary's county sample but both counties have a large, roughly equal, moderate core. The Gray Panthers are almost exclusively self-described liberals.

The NoSay Variable

Ideally, we would have compared the efficacy variable across samples, but some of the usual efficacy questions were not included in the 1992 ANES survey. However, we can examine one question, "People like me don't have any say about what the government does" [NOSAY], which is usually a component of internal efficacy, to get a sense of similarities between samples. A comparison of responses is surprising.

The close relationship between *efficacy* and political participation was discussed in Chapter Three, as was the high correlation between *education* and political participation. Similarly, there is a close correlation between *efficacy* and *education*. Recalling how much lower the education levels of the

ANES sample are compared to the study sample, we expected the number of seniors agreeing with the "NOSAY" question would be much higher in the ANES sample. In fact, this happened. Forty-two percent of the ANES sample agree they have no say, in comparison to 16 percent of the study sample. However, 52 percent of the ANES sample disagree, and feel they do have a say. In other words, the correlation between education and this aspect of efficacy is lower than expected for the ANES sample. Roughly 70 percent of the study sample disagree with the "NOSAY" question -- across all three samples. Surprisingly, county residents are as likely to disagree as Gray Panthers. These results support a correlation between education and efficacy but, with this question at least, the correlation is a weak one.

The Political Activity Variable

A comparison of the political activity scores in the ANES sample with our study sample gives another rough idea of how our sample compares with a more representative sample. Using questions available in the 1992 survey, we constructed a scale roughly measuring political activity by summing the (yes/no) scores to six questions each measuring various aspects of political activity (contributing money, attending political meetings, working in election campaigns, solving community problems, voting in national elections, and wearing a campaign

button). A similar scale, also the sum of yes/no scores, was constructed for our study sample.

While the numbers are rough, they reveal some important similarities and differences. Using overall numbers, roughly 90 percent of the ANES sample fall into the "none" or the "low" participation categories. Seventy-five percent of those are in the low category which probably means they do not participate beyond voting. They are what Verba and Nie call "voting specialists." The remaining 10 percent fall mostly in the moderate activity category -- only 2 percent are highly active. [This may call into question studies of senior political participation which use ANES data. Without a full range of senior participants, little differentiation can be made between the most active and the least.]

The study sample, fortunately, does not mirror the national sample but instead includes a wider range of activity levels. Only 2 percent are completely inactive. Between the other three categories, the numbers are almost evenly divided: 37 percent low, 27 percent medium, and 34 percent high. When we look at the subsamples, we see that while the Panthers contribute substantially to the "high" category, many seniors in the two county samples also fall there. Specifically, the two county samples are quite similar in distribution: Arlington has 1 percent none, 54 percent low, 24 percent medium, and 21 percent high; St Mary's has 2 percent none, 47 percent low, 29 percent

medium, and 22 percent high. The Panthers, on the other hand, have 2 percent none, 8 percent low, 29 percent medium, and 61 percent high. Activity will be measured differently in the next section, as we move away from constraints imposed by the variety of questions included in the 1992 survey.

In Sum

With no quantitative data available to answer our three research questions, it was necessary for the author to collect the data herself. The self-administered survey instrument was chosen, sacrificing indepth knowledge of a few for greater understanding of the many. The questionnaire was designed with all three research questions in mind, and questions were obtained from a variety of sources. ANES questions were incorporated whenever possible because they have been tested for validity over time and can demonstrate the ways in which a small, local sample may be more or less representative of the nation as a whole. Socialization questions were borrowed from studies such as those conducted by Chaffee et al, Oliner and Oliner, Hess and Torney, and Baumrind. Seniors were asked to describe the frequency of their participation in a variety of both passive and active type of political engagement both before and after 60 to measure both current levels of political participation and change over time. Variables thought to

contribute to those activity levels were measured in the remainder of the survey. Participation variables such as education, income, efficacy and party identification followed the section measuring engagement levels. Socialization variables, measured in the last section, were the most challenging for respondents. Possible reasons for this might include the following: the information requested was in the "distant" past and/or too personal, the survey was too long, and/or the questions were poorly designed.⁹

Despite the difficulties faced in designing, administering, and coding a survey for 319 individuals located in a variety of locations throughout and just beyond the Washington Metropolitan area, the findings discussed in the following chapters made the arduous process worthwhile. The findings are, in many cases, quite surprising.

In Chapter Five we turn our attention to research questions 1 and 2 which ask: *(1) Can we characterize the political engagement of seniors as one of change or continuity over the life course? and (2) If we see change, is it in the direction of more or less involvement?* Thus, Chapter Five is devoted to findings concerning continuity versus change.

Chapter Four Notes

1. The special needs of seniors were considered in question wording and font size. Surprisingly, seniors themselves suggested normal font size was most appropriate. Postage rates suggested a survey five pages or less for a regular stamp. Questions were not abbreviated or squeezed together, and were written as clearly as possible to avoid confusion. Respondents were often instructed to circle appropriate responses. Contingency questions were also avoided to prevent confusion. Clear instructions and introductory comments were included when necessary. In addition, questions were broken up into labelled sections to add interest and logic, and to avoid the perception of a never-ending series of unrelated questions. The questionnaire was pretested twice to check features such as question wording, font size, and survey length.

2. Placing socialization questions at the end of the somewhat lengthy survey may have been a poor choice. See note 9 below.

3. Age 60 was chosen to designate senior status for several reasons. First, that age was suggested by seniors themselves in a pretest. Additionally, it was learned that the average age of retirement is currently 62 (Torres-Gil, 1992). Age was used, as opposed to "before and after retirement," for four reasons:

(1) Literature suggests retirement has little independent effect on participation other than allowing individuals to devote more time to activities they were involved in before retirement.

(2) Women who were never employed outside the home are not "retired" as seniors but may have just as much free time once childcare responsibilities are over. (Women who worked in the home throughout their lives felt they qualified for the term "retirement" unofficially, but couldn't use it officially.)

(3) Questions concerning employment status and free time allow us to measure the attributes of retirement we are most concerned with without using the value laden term "retirement."

(4) Retirement is not truly a dichotomous variable (e.g. many former military personnel are partially retired.)

We were particularly sensitive to the feelings of women because according to data presented by Torres-Gil in *The New Aging* (1992), elderly women outnumber men three to two (19). Women live longer than men by an average of seven to eight years (25). (See also Suzman et al., 1992, 25.) In addition, a visit to any senior center, nursing home, or other gathering place of the elderly will visually confirm these statistics.

4 & 5. All these variables are measured according to the same underlying metric. See Variable List in Appendix.

6. Prefixes, M- D- and MD-, indicate to whom the adjective refers to, i.e. MDWARM for warm relationship between parents. While, Easterbrooks and Emde (in Hinde and Hinde, 1988) suggest the importance of the marital relationship itself, and questions are designed to include that aspect of the home environment, few seniors chose to comment on their parent's relationship.

7. The first pretest was administered to 20 seniors. Type set was very large and although questions were primarily multiple choice, a few short answer questions were also included to measure variables such as motivation for political action. Those surveyed suggested smaller type, fewer questions, and no short answer questions. The second survey incorporated those suggestions and discarded most of the previous socialization questions in favor of less complicated, multiple choice questions. The final survey which included most of the questions from pretest 2 and added more specific questions concerning childhood socialization can be found in the Appendix.

8. This was not only a convenient technique for reaching large groups of seniors, but also a deliberate effort to reach conservative activists to counterbalance the liberal Panther activists.

9. In all, 234 respondents of the 319 surveyed, completed the entire survey. All 319 respondents filled out the majority of questions in the participation section. There are a number of factors which might explain why many declined to fill out the socialization section including: the information requested was too personal (and perhaps too painful for some) to discuss, this section was not pretested as well as the first (many changes were made after the second pretest and simply included without testing into the final survey), respondents were tired of answering questions by the time they reached this section, and/or the respondents did not remember their childhood well enough to feel comfortable answering questions about it (the memory issue). Gray Panthers were the most willing to answer the entire survey, perhaps because they agreed to fill out the survey before receiving it in the mail, and perhaps because they understood more about the nature of the study. Figure 4.1 presents data on missing values by subsample.

FIGURE 4.1 MISSING DATA IN STUDY BY SUBSAMPLE

	<u>Arlington Co</u>	<u>St Mary's Co</u>	<u>Gray Panthers</u>	<u>row totals</u>
<i>Filled out</i> <i>entire survey</i>	74	64	96	319
<i>Ignored</i> <i>socialization</i> <i>section</i>	46	35	4	85
<i>Subsample Totals</i>	120	99	100	319

CHAPTER 5: FINDINGS: CONTINUITY VERSUS CHANGE

This study observes continuity versus change with respect to four engagement variables -- political activity, political attention, voting activity, and political interest. Literature reviewed in Chapter Two leads us to hypothesize that *continuity* most accurately describes the political behavior of the majority of seniors. For the minority of seniors who report change in their level of activity, we hypothesize that there will be no particular pattern, as many will increase their engagement in a specific activity as decrease their involvement. We agree with arguments made by Jankowski and Strate who point out, "...there are no clear theoretical reasons why age should have an identical effect on each of the different modes of political participation... It seems likely that the impact of various age-related processes and statuses (sic) would vary across modes of participation" (1995, 92). Thus, change when it occurs will not be uniform but will vary according to the nature of the activity. Prior evidence concerning the direction of change is too contradictory to allow us to formulate an hypothesis. This general lack of information concerning change is reflected in Sigel's observation that we don't know specifically what activities change over time or why (Sigel, 1989, x).

Thus, the data in this chapter concerning when, where, and in what direction change occurs represents a significant step forward in both participation and adult socialization research. While studies like this one begin the process of identifying which activities change over time, future studies can concentrate on why this occurs.

One way in which to observe continuity versus change in respect to our four sets of variables -- political activity, political attention, voting and political interest -- is to cross tabulate their before sixty values against their after sixty values. The contingency tables in the first section focus on continuity in terms of the entire sample of seniors. Figure 5.6, in the second section, focuses on change in terms of both each subsample of seniors and each aspect of our dimension variables.

Findings

Generally speaking, we find more evidence of change than expected. If we look at seniors simply in terms of change versus no change for each category we find the greatest change in overall levels of political activity (67 percent) and political attention (55 percent) and the least change in levels of voting activity (19 percent) and political interest (29

percent). This macro view of continuity versus change is presented in Figure 5.1, and taken by itself, can be quite misleading. While one aspect of an engagement dimension may increase, another may decrease, and thus the level of activity does not change. Information presented in the next four tables compares levels of political activity before sixty with levels after sixty to get a sense of both the direction and degree of real change.

FIGURE 5.1 CONTINUITY VERSUS CHANGE: A MACRO VIEW

<u>Variables</u>	<u>No Change</u>	<u>Change</u>
<i>Political Activity</i>	(104) 33%	(215) 67%
<i>Political Attention</i>	(142) 45%	(177) 55%
<i>Voting Activity</i>	(259) 81%	(60) 19%
<i>Political Interest</i>	(225) 71%	(92) 29%

Notes:

1. *Political Activity* percents computed by running *POLACT2A* by *CHPOLACT*.
2. *Political Attention* percents computed by running *POLATN2A* by *CHPOLATN*.
3. *Voting Activity* percents computed by running *VOTE2A* by *CHVOTE*.
4. *Political Interest* percents computed by running *POLINT2A* by *CHPOLINT*.
5. Total N = (319)

The variables used to tap our four dimensions of political engagement were described in the preceding chapter. Note that variables ending in a 1 connote the before sixty value, those ending in a 2, the after sixty value.

Political Activity

In Figure 5.2 we see that in terms of continuity, 75 percent of those highly active before sixty remain highly active after sixty. Correspondingly, 93 percent of those not active at all before sixty are not at all active after sixty, 77 percent of those not very active before sixty remain equally inactive after sixty; and 64 percent of those moderately active before sixty remain that way after sixty.

Figure 5.2: PRE-60 BY POST-60 POLITICAL ACTIVITY

<i>Pre-60 Pol. Activity</i>	<i>Post-60 Political Activity</i>				<i>(N)</i>
	<i>none</i>	<i>low</i>	<i>moderate</i>	<i>high</i>	
<i>none</i>	93%	0%	7%	0%	(15)
<i>low</i>	3%	77%	16%	4%	(116)
<i>moderate</i>	0%	26%	64%	10%	(77)
<i>high</i>	2%	6%	17%	75%	(111)

Note:

1. Percentages represent row percents.
2. Total N (319)
3. Table tau-b = .71

When we look at those who changed, the majority of those most active before sixty decreased their activity level by one category. The most highly active became moderately active, those moderately active became not very active. However, with regard to those who were not very active before sixty, of those who changed, most increased their level of activity. Those not

very active before sixty largely became moderately active after sixty. All of those who changed from not active at all became moderately active. Thus, we will look at specific aspects of activity later in this chapter to account for these findings.

Political Attention

In Figure 5.3, an even greater percentage, 93 percent of those very attentive before sixty, continue to be very attentive after sixty. Likewise, 53 percent of those not very attentive before sixty continue to be not very attentive after sixty, and 72 percent of those moderately attentive before sixty continue to be moderately attentive after sixty.

FIGURE 5.3: PRE-60 BY POST-60 POLITICAL ATTENTION

<i>Pre-60 Pol. Attention</i>	<i>Post-60 Political Attention</i>				<i>(N)</i>
	<i>none</i>	<i>low</i>	<i>moderate</i>	<i>high</i>	
<i>low</i>	0%	53%	44%	3%	(59)
<i>moderate</i>	0%	5%	72%	24%	(162)
<i>high</i>	2%	0%	5%	93%	(98)

Note:

1. Percentages represent row percents.
2. Total N (319)
3. Table tau-c = .63

For those who change, 44 percent of those not very attentive before sixty report moderate attention after sixty. Twenty-four percent of those moderately attentive before sixty

report being highly attentive after sixty and only 7 percent of the highly attentive before sixty decreased their attention level. Most of those moved into the moderately attentive category. Thus, while the implication is still continuity for most, for those who change, the activity level increases.

Voting Activity

Percentages in Figure 5.4 suggest that continuity is strongest in this dimension of political engagement. *Ninety-five percent of the most frequent voters before sixty continue that pattern after sixty.* Likewise, those who didn't vote often before sixty tend to either continue that way after sixty or increase their voting activity. However, there are very few nonvoters in our sample so comparisons are difficult to make.

FIGURE 5.4: PRE-60 BY POST-60 VOTING ACTIVITY

<i>Pre-60 Voting</i>	<i>Post-60 Voting Activity</i>				<i>(N)</i>
	<i>none</i>	<i>low</i>	<i>moderate</i>	<i>high</i>	
<i>none/low</i>	25%	33%	58%	83%	(7)
<i>moderate</i>	1%	1%	82%	15%	(91)
<i>high</i>	1%	0%	4%	95%	(221)

Note:

1. Percentages represent row percents.
2. The none and low categories are collapsed as 7 seniors are not enough to stand on their own.
3. Total N (319)
4. Table tau-b = .77

Political Interest

In Figure 5.5, 95 percent of those most interested before sixty are most interested after sixty. However, only 20 percent of those not very interested before sixty stay that way after sixty. In fact, 36 percent of those not very interested before sixty report moderate interest and 44 percent report high interest after sixty. Thus, this variable indicates both continuity and change. When change occurs it is in the direction of increased interest.

FIGURE 5.5: PRE-60 BY POST-60 POLITICAL INTEREST

Pre-60 Pol. Interest	Post-60 Political Interest			(N)
	low	moderate	high	
low	20%	36%	44%	(25)
moderate	5%	24%	70%	(77)
high	0%	5%	95%	(111)

Note:

1. Percentages represent row percents.
2. Total N (319)
3. Table tau-b = .43

In Sum

In each instance we note that despite the evidence presented in Figure 5.1, *continuity* tends to characterize the actions of our seniors. Those highly active in a particular dimension before sixty are most likely to be the most highly active in that dimension after sixty. *When change occurs after*

sixty, it is in the direction of *increased involvement for attention, interest and voting*. However, with respect to *political activity the findings are mixed*.

Measuring Change

We move now beyond the general findings described above to explore separate measures of change. We examine the fourteen different items used to measure the political engagement. These include: watching television news [CHTVNEWS]; watching television political shows [CHTVSHOW]; reading political news in papers and/or magazines [CHREAD]; listening to political talk radio [CHLISTEN]; voting in local and/or state elections [CHVOTLOC]; voting in primaries and/or caucuses [CHVOTPRI]; voting in national elections [CHVOTNAT]; attending political meetings or rallies [CHMTGS]; working with others to solve community problems [CHCOMPRO]; personally contacting politicians [CHCONTAC]; working in election campaigns [CHWORK]; contributing money to parties, candidates, and/or causes [CHMONEY]; demonstrating on behalf of a particular cause [CHPROTES], and level of political interest [CHPOLINT].

Figure 5.6 summarizes the findings concerning continuity and change for each dimension of political engagement, further differentiated by subsample. As we saw in the contingency tables, they indicate that for each dimension, at least sixty

percent of a given subgroup reported **no change** in activity level before and after sixty.

Overall, change is least likely in the dimension of voting (the percentages in the "no change" columns are the greatest). In this sense the study sample mirrors the ANES sample which is dominated by "voting specialists." For those reporting change, Figure 5.6 also explains the direction of that change. For example, those reporting change in voting frequency tend to increase that activity in the two county samples, and decrease that activity in the Gray Panther sample. However, Panthers are also the most likely to report no change in voting activity and to have the highest voting levels before sixty.

We see a great deal of continuity in the political activity dimension. As we saw earlier, the direction of change in this dimension as a whole shows no overall trend. Instead, we need to look at individual aspects of political activity.

Across samples, seniors who change tend to decrease community problem solving activity, decrease attendance at meetings and rallies, and decrease election work (despite their greater amounts of free time). Tendencies are not as clear for the other two factors. Both contacting public officials and contributing money have almost as many seniors increasing as decreasing their activity. Continuity is highest in the county samples for protest activity. This statistic actually represents the fact that few of these residents report any protest

activity before or after sixty. For those who do report it, Arlington residents tend to decrease that activity, while as many St Mary's residents increase as decrease their protest behavior.

FIGURE 5.6: CONTINUITY VERSUS CHANGE: A MICRO VIEW

<u>VARIABLES</u>	<u>SUBSAMPLES</u>								
	<u>ARLINGTON</u>			<u>ST MARY'S</u>			<u>PANTHERS</u>		
	(N=120)			(N=99)			(N=100)		
	No Change	Less	More	No Change	Less	More	No Change	Less	More

Activity:

CHCOMPRO.....	71%	19%	10%	65%	26%	9%	65%	18%	6%
CHCONTAC.....	69	17	14	65	17	18	64	16	18
CHMONEY.....	73	13	14	72	12	16	75	14	11
CHMTGS.....	72	21	8	79	14	7	66	21	11
CHPROTES.....	87	10	3	86	7	7	73	12	13
CHWORK.....	73	17	11	71	16	3	61	23	14

Attention:

CHLISTEN.....	61	15	24	66	14	20	71	6	21
CHREAD.....	76	7	18	72	11	17	81	7	10
CHTVNEWS.....	77	6	18	79	4	17	77	7	14
CHTVSHOW.....	73	5	22	61	9	30	73	6	19

Voting:

CHVOTLOC.....	85	8	7	92	0	8	91	4	3
CHVOTNAT.....	93	3	5	94	1	5	95	2	1
CHVOTPRI.....	81	8	11	89	2	9	93	2	3

Interest:

CHPOLINT.....	69	8	24	63	6	31	81	9	10
---------------	----	---	-----------	----	---	-----------	----	---	-----------

Note:

Bold face on numbers indicates direction of greatest change.

Continuity also dominates in the more "passive" political attention dimension. As expected, for those who change, the tendency is clearly in the direction of increased activity in every aspect of this dimension. This holds true for all three subsamples. Percentages for increased listening to the radio and increased watching of TV political shows are very high.

Although not a dimension of political engagement, political interest is also included in Figure 5.5 both because it is measured for change over time and because it is so closely related to the three dimension variables. In fact, we see the same kind of patterns in the interest variable as we see in the attention dimension. While continuity dominates, for those who change, the tendency is clearly in the direction of increased interest for all three subsamples. It is especially pronounced for the two county samples who were not as interested before sixty as were the Panthers.

In Chapter Two, based on the socialization literature, **three hypotheses** were presented in connection with the first two research questions. The first, **continuity**, characterizes *political engagement -- levels of political activity before and after sixty remain fairly constant*, **is supported** by these data. For each dimension, at least sixty percent of a given subgroup reported *no change* in activity level before and after sixty. In some cases percentages ranged in the low 90's. We see the most continuity across samples for protest activity, reading and

watching the news, and voting in local, state and national elections. We see the most continuity within the Panther sample. Their levels for all activities tend to be high before and after sixty. However, while continuity predominates, change is more frequent than expected.

The second hypothesis, ***the greater the political engagement before sixty, the greater the political engagement after sixty, is also supported*** by these data. Because continuity dominates for the majority of seniors, those highly active in a particular dimension before sixty are most likely to be the most highly active in that dimension after sixty. In addition, high levels of any one of these variables are likely to correspond to high levels in all of the other three.

And the third hypothesis, ***for those who show change instead of continuity, no particular pattern of engagement will be in evidence. As many seniors will increase their engagement in a particular activity as will decrease that activity is not supported*** by these data. The areas of greatest change depend on the type of activity. In terms of change, Panthers are more like the other two subsamples than different. In general, seniors who change their activity levels tend to increase voting, decrease political activities other than voting (with the exception of contacting officials and donating money), and increase political attention and interest.

There is startling consistency across samples which suggests a pattern which goes beyond sample variations to a phenomenon best explained by age itself. While we are looking at only fourteen different aspects of political engagement, seniors in Arlington County, St Mary's County, and throughout the metropolitan area are showing similar patterns with regard to those activities *regardless of their overall participation levels*. It points to a certain reliability in the data itself. These numbers do not seem to be inflated by the respondents; frequency levels seem to have been reported with care. The amount and consistency of variation suggests seniors did not simply circle answers at random.

In the next chapter we look at findings in terms of research question three which asks: *How do the childhood socialization experiences of highly politically engaged seniors compare with the childhood socialization experiences of less politically engaged seniors?* We look at the evidence to see what correlation exists between socialization variables we outlined in Chapter Two and Four and not only our three dimensions of political engagement, but also Panthers versus non-Panthers.

CHAPTER 6: FINDINGS: CHILDHOOD SOCIALIZATION VARIABLES

Socialization research offers a large body of literature dealing specifically with the parent-child relationship. In Chapter Two, we hypothesized that: *Childhood determinants of "prosocial" behavior are related to childhood determinants of political behavior. Some parental behaviors increase the potential for political activity as a senior citizen; other behaviors decrease the potential for political activity as a senior citizen.*

Faced with a large number of variables to choose from, we borrowed from research primarily conducted by Chaffee et al., Baumrind, and Oliner and Oliner. These studies concentrate on several aspects of the parent-child relationship: communication (i.e., how much discussion is encouraged), the nature of the relationship (i.e., nurturance, control, maturity demands), role modeling, emphasis on religion, and parental partisanship. The remainder of this chapter compares our findings with what the literature led us to expect.

Correlation Coefficients

As a first step in exploring the relationship between socialization variables and each subsample, we examined the correlation coefficients. The size of the coefficient and the

size of its associated significance value tell us about the strength of the relationship. The coefficient's positive or negative sign tells us the direction of the relationship. For a table presenting all the correlation coefficients and associated t values for the variables used in this study, see the Appendix. Based on the socialization variables identified as highly correlated through this process, contingency tables were created to further explore the relationships. Tables present a more detailed picture of the relationship. The remainder of the chapter discusses the findings that emerged as a result of both the correlation coefficients and the associated contingency tables. When appropriate, these contingency tables are included in the discussion. All tables referenced in this manner can be found in the Appendix.

Potentially Important Predictors

Based on the correlation coefficients and contingency tables, only a few variables emerge as potentially important predictors. We find the socialization variables most highly correlated with the political activity and attention dimensions include the area in which the individual was raised [PSLIVE] and the parent-child political communication environment [POLCOMM]. Variables associated specifically with the voting dimension also include the area in which the individual was raised [PSLIVE] along with being encouraged to express opinions as a child

[EXPRESS] and perceiving one's father as powerful [POWERDAD]. Political communication and expressing opinions will be discussed in the Chaffee section below. The variable representing politically active mothers [MPOLACT] is also highly correlated with all three dimensions of political engagement. However, as there are only seven individuals who had very active mothers, this finding is very tentative. Other than the MPOLACT variable, we will be using the variables listed here along with participation variables identified in Chapter Seven to predict dimensions of political engagement in Chapter Eight.

Area Raised

A variable concerning where a senior was raised [PSLIVE], included in the survey as a counterpoint to where the senior currently lives, surprisingly emerged as one important to all three dimensions. While the participation literature suggests that urban dwellers tend to be more active than their rural counterparts, there is little evidence available to suggest the effect of the area where one is raised on future political engagement. *For this sample, in every dimension, being raised in an urban/suburban area increases the likelihood of political engagement as a senior. Because there are so few studies which include this variable, and the evidence of those that do is contradictory, it is a noteworthy finding.*

For example, of the 96 most politically active, the majority (55 percent) came from urban areas (with the remainder divided as follows: 8 percent from suburban, 10 percent from large towns, 19 percent from small towns and 7 percent from rural areas). Of the 115 individuals in the low activity category, the highest percentage (53 percent) came from small towns/rural areas (with the remainder divided as follows: 16 percent from large towns, 10 percent from the suburbs and 21 percent from urban areas). Since almost half (137) of the total sample were raised in rural areas or small towns, these findings do not seem to be simply the result of a sample too heavily drawn from urban areas.

Similarly, we find the highest attentiveness levels associated with senior citizens raised in urban areas. Of the 131 most politically attentive, the majority (46 percent) came from urban areas and another 12 percent from suburban areas in comparison to 27 percent from small towns and 6 percent from rural areas. Of the 39 individuals in the low attention category, the highest percentage (36 percent) come from small towns with an additional 18 percent from rural areas as opposed to 16 percent from large towns, 5 percent from the suburbs and 26 percent from urban areas.

The highest voting levels are also associated with senior citizens raised in urban areas, but the relationship is weaker because so few do not vote. Of the 227 most frequent voters,

the majority (40 percent) come from urban areas, 10 percent from suburban areas, 11 percent from large towns, 29 percent from small towns and 10 percent from rural areas. Of the 85 next most frequent voters, the majority (37 percent) come from small towns, 17 percent from rural areas, 17 percent from large towns, 6 percent from suburban areas and 25 percent from urban areas.

Finally, a comparison of where individuals live now [LVNOW] with where they were raised [PSLIVE] reveals that most Panthers have lived their entire lives in a suburban/urban environment, again giving support to the importance of this factor for senior engagement. However, St Mary's and Arlington County residents have a wider variety of backgrounds. Thirty-two percent of St Mary's seniors (who currently live in a rural/small town area) were raised in the opposite -- a suburban/urban environment. Similarly, 46 percent of Arlington seniors (who currently live in the suburbs) were also raised in the opposite -- a rural/small town environment. This information is important because it suggests that the area raised variable is not simply a reflection of a senior's current residence.

Power Variables

The two power variables, first suggested by Hess and Torney, look at the influence of having "active and powerful" male and female role models in developing politically involved progeny (1967, 193). While perception of the mother's power

[POWERMOM] is poorly correlated with any of our sample, there is a relationship between [POWERDAD] and both the Gray Panther sample and the voting dimension.

Unlike the relationship suggested by Hess and Torney, Panthers tend to come from a home where the father is low to moderate in power. Panthers are most likely to describe their fathers as moderately powerful (63 percent). Roughly 55 percent of the two county samples, however, describe their fathers as very powerful. While Panthers are the most likely to describe their fathers as low in power, the percentages in this category are low across samples. Looking at Figure 6.4 we see the Panthers associated with low power levels in both parents and the most active associated with fathers low in power.

As far as the voting dimension is concerned, acknowledging our lack of nonvoters, of the four in this contingency table, all fall into the low power category. The vast majority of frequent voters describe their fathers as moderately to very powerful. This finding is more in keeping with Hess and Torney's finding.

Politically Active Mothers

Politically active mothers [MPOLACT] as positive role models held up across all three dimensions of political engagement, but as there were only seven individuals with very active mothers, this finding is very tentative. In addition,

eleven seniors had moderately active mothers. Of the seven with the highly active mothers, six are currently moderately to highly active; one is not very active. Of the eleven with moderately active mothers, all are moderately or highly active. However, those without politically active mothers are only slightly more likely to be not very active. We have similar results in each dimension. Thus, while we cannot say that the most active, attentive, or frequent voters had politically active mothers, we can say that those who did have them tended to become at least moderately, and many cases very, politically active and attentive as well as, frequent voters.

The Chaffee Typology

To quickly recap, Chaffee, McLeod and Wackman (1973) researched the relationship between adolescent political participation and family communication patterns. Focusing their attention on the level of open discussion encouraged (concept-oriented communication), and the level of social disharmony tolerated (socio-oriented communication), they created a typology in which families high in both categories (*pluralistic*) typically encourage their children to explore new ideas and expose them to controversial material and thus produce children with the highest political knowledge, campaign activity, awareness, affect, and news media usage (353). In families low in both categories (*laissez-faire*), children are not discouraged

from challenging parental views, and they are not encouraged to express independent ideas (351). Laissez-faire children and their parents are below average in all aspects of political participation (361). Protective families encourage children to get along with others and to avoid conflict (351). Consensual families expose children to different points of view and encourage them to express themselves, but within a context consonant with the parental opinions (351).

The Chaffee questions are replicated in the study survey, and the SOCIO and CONCEPT scales created. When we correlate these two scales with the Gray Panther sample, Arlington County residents, St Mary's County residents, and our three dimensions of political engagement (activity, attention, and voting), the SOCIO scale is highly correlated with only the Gray Panthers and the political activity dimension, but the CONCEPT scale is not highly correlated with any of the above.

However, we also recoded these scales into low and high, and created a series of Chaffee contingency tables (see Variable List in Appendix for details about scale recoding). These tables not only compare Panthers to non-Panthers, but also compare by activity level across all three engagement dimensions. Figure 6.1 includes all four contingency tables and reveals that while the vast majority of seniors come from what Chaffee would term "laissez-faire" and "consensual" homes, if we look at just those from "pluralistic" homes, the largest

percentage are (1) Gray Panthers (16 percent), (2) the most politically active (13 percent), (3) the moderately attentive (11 percent) followed closely by the 9 percent highly attentive, and (4) the most frequent voters (10 percent). Thus, while the numbers are small, the direction is quite clear. If we look at the other three types of family environments -- consensual, protective, and laissez-faire -- no clear patterns emerge.

*These findings suggest that if an individual is raised in a pluralistic home s/he is likely to be very active, attentive and a frequent voter. However, if an individual comes from a consensual, protective or laissez-faire home s/he is as likely to be inactive as very active. **This is a significant non-finding.*** At least from the standpoint of parent-child communication patterns, while pluralistic homes may have given children a push in the direction of increased political engagement, many seniors still become highly engaged even without that push. These seniors came from a variety of backgrounds and the great majority did not have the advantage of a pluralistic home. Had there been significant correlations evident, the future for children in homes that were not pluralistic would be predictably nonpolitical. It is encouraging to think that our most politically active seniors emerged from **both** pluralistic and nonpluralistic family backgrounds. In fact, very few had the advantage of a pluralistic communication environment.

FIGURE 6.1: THE CHAFFEE TYPOLOGY AND SAMPLE RESULTS

COMPARING PANTHERS TO ARLINGTON AND ST MARY'S COUNTY RESIDENTS

		CONCEPT-ORIENTED COMMUNICATION (level of open-discussion encouraged)			
		Low		High	
SOCIO-ORIENTED Communication	Low	Laissez-faire		Consensual	
		Arl'n	52% (35)	Arl'n	36% (24)
		StM's	49% (27)	StM's	47% (26)
		GP's	48% (40)	GP's	36% (30)
	High (level of social disharmony tolerated)	Protective		Pluralistic	
		Arl'n	5% (3)	Arl'n	8% (5)
		StM's	2% (1)	StM's	2% (1)
		GP's	0% (0)	GP's	16% (13)

COMPARING BY ACTIVITY LEVEL

		Low		High	
Socio-oriented Communication	Low	Laissez-faire		Consensual	
		NONE	71% (5)	NONE	29% (2)
		LOW	56% (36)	LOW	31% (20)
		MEDIUM	47% (27)	MEDIUM	46% (26)
		HIGH	44% (34)	HIGH	42% (32)
	High	Protective		Pluralistic	
		NONE	0% (0)	NONE	0% (0)
		LOW	5% (3)	LOW	8% (5)
		MEDIUM	0% (0)	MEDIUM	7% (4)
		HIGH	1% (1)	HIGH	13% (10)

COMPARING BY ATTENTION LEVEL

	Low	Low	High
		<i>Laissez-faire</i>	<i>Consensual</i>
<i>Socio-oriented Communication</i>		NONE 100% (2)	NONE 0% (0)
		LOW 67% (12)	LOW 22% (4)
		MEDIUM 45% (40)	MEDIUM 43% (38)
		HIGH 50% (48)	HIGH 40% (38)
	High	<i>Protective</i>	<i>Pluralistic</i>
		NONE 0% (0)	NONE 0% (0)
		LOW 11% (2)	LOW 0% (0)
		MEDIUM 1% (1)	MEDIUM 11% (10)
		HIGH 1% (1)	HIGH 9% (9)

COMPARING BY VOTING LEVEL

	Low	Low	High
		<i>Laissez-faire</i>	<i>Consensual</i>
<i>Socio-oriented Communication</i>		NONE 100% (2)	NONE 0% (0)
		LOW 100% (1)	LOW 0% (0)
		MEDIUM 48% (13)	MEDIUM 44% (12)
		HIGH 49% (86)	HIGH 39% (68)
	High	<i>Protective</i>	<i>Pluralistic</i>
		NONE 0% (0)	NONE 0% (0)
		LOW 0% (0)	LOW 0% (0)
		MEDIUM 4% (1)	MEDIUM 4% (1)
		HIGH 2% (3)	HIGH 10% (18)

Notes:

% = percent of the total for that category.

() = sample N, total N = 205, missing observations = 114

In addition to the Chaffee variables, we also created another political communication construct called [POLCOMM]. (See Chapter Four, or Appendix for details.) This construct borrows from both the Chaffee SOCIO scale [ARGUE], and the CONCEPT scale

[DISCUSS, EXPRESS, VISIT]. It seems to do a better job than either of the Chaffee scales at tapping into a valuable source of future political activity.

Political communication [POLCOMM] is poorly correlated with the Gray Panther sample, although it is moderately correlated with levels of political activity [POLACT2]. The majority of those with the best political communication environment as children became very politically active. However, those with poor communication environments as children are almost as likely to become politically active as they are to become inactive as seniors. Thus, for this sample at least, while the relationship is not a strong one, greater parental emphasis on communication does foster future political behavior. However, lack of such emphasis does not preclude it. A similar relationship exists between political communication [POLCOMM] and the political attention dimension [POLATTN2].

For the voting dimension, the political communication [POLCOMM] construct is not highly correlated, but three related variables are -- expressing opinions [EXPRESS], being taught to give in on arguments [GIVEIN], and the frequency of family discussions about politics [PSCOM1]. The relationship between voting and EXPRESS is typical of these three. Of the 17 individuals who were raised with the most freedom to express their opinion, all fall into the most frequent voter category. The only individuals (3 people) who fall into the never or

seldom vote categories were "never" allowed to express themselves. However, the remaining 96 percent fall into the highest two voting categories. While these numbers are extremely small, they do suggest a relationship and that relationship is supported further in the literature (and in the other two tables -- GIVEIN and PSCOM1). (In the GIVEIN table nonvoters tend to be associated with having been raised to "give in" on arguments.) Thus, while the most frequent voters come from both expressive and repressive backgrounds, discouraging children from expressing themselves seems to make them less likely to vote as an adult.

Thus, while the Chaffee scales as originally construed [SOCIO, CONCEPT] were only weakly related to the individuals in this study, a scale [POLCOMM] derived primarily from Chaffee variables is very useful for this study and is a potentially important predictor for future political engagement.

The Baumrind Typology

While the Chaffee model looks exclusively at the communication environment, Baumrind's study attempts to combine the effects of nurturance with control, maturity demands and parent-child communication to create a more inclusive picture of the home environment. By clustering parental ratings on these four dimensions, Baumrind derives three major types or patterns of child rearing from her research: authoritative,

authoritarian, and permissive (Eisenberg and Mussen, 1989, 80-81). Authoritative and authoritarian parenting are closely related. The former is warmer and while demanding, is clear about the reasons for those demands. Permissive parents are warm and undemanding.

Baumrind concludes that authoritative childrearing is the only pattern that consistently (and significantly) produces children high in social competence and social responsibility and fails to produce incompetent children (low in both social competence and social responsibility) in the preschool years and middle childhood. This study replicates Baumrind's approach to see if the same relationship can be found between authoritative parenting and future political behavior.

The four dimensions suggested by Baumrind: nurturance, control, maturity demands and parent-child communication correspond (respectively) to four study variables: the parent's warmth construct [PARSWARM], the parent's control construct [PCONTROL], the "how early adult responsibilities were assumed" variable [RESPON], and the political communication construct discussed in the previous section [POLCOMM]. Based on the descriptions of the three parent "types," Figure 6.2 illustrates the relationships we expected.

FIGURE 6.2: THE BAUERIND TYPOLOGY AND STUDY VARIABLES

	<i>PARSWARM</i> (nurturance)	<i>PCONTROL</i> (control)	<i>RESPON</i> (maturity demands)	<i>POLCOMM</i> (communication)
<i>Parent Types:</i>				
<i>Authoritative</i>	high	high	high	high
<i>Authoritarian</i>	low	high	high	low
<i>Permissive</i>	high	low	low	low

By statistically "forcing" our study cases to fall into three clusters based on these four dimensions, we matched subsamples against parent types.¹ We hypothesized in Chapter Two that authoritative parenting would increase the potential for political engagement as a senior citizen while authoritarian and permissive parenting would do the opposite. *The findings presented in Figure 6.3 do not support this hypothesis.* If we look at the most engaged in each dimension we see a fairly even distribution across parent types. Only in the low engagement category of each dimension do we see any suggestion of a pattern. Those in the low activity range seem to be more inclined to come from authoritarian homes. Although the distribution is fairly even, a greater percentage of Gray Panthers come more from authoritative homes (39 percent) rather than authoritarian (30 percent) or permissive ones (31 percent).²

Thus, the correlation coefficients and associated significance tests generally indicate a weak relationship for most of the Baumrind variables (which precludes their use as predictors). Cluster analysis is similarly unhelpful in this study. Engaged seniors do not cluster with authoritative parent types as well as we had hoped. However, the least engaged do seem to be more apt to have had authoritarian parenting. When we look at Baumrind variables separately, they often act very differently than expected.

FIGURE 6.3: CLUSTER ANALYSIS USING BAUMRIND TYPOLOGY

	AUTHORITATIVE	PERMISSIVE	AUTHORITARIAN
Subsamples:			
GROUPS			
Panthers n(96)	39%	31%	30%
Arlington n(73)	22%	45%	33%
St Mary's n(63)	27%	32%	41%
POLITICAL ACTIVITY			
None n(10)	40%	0%	60%
Low n(69)	28%	14%	58%
Medium n(66)	36%	23%	41%
High n(81)	38%	27%	42%
POLITICAL ATTENTION			
None n(2)	0%	100%	0%
Low n(25)	20%	28%	52%
Medium n(98)	35%	30%	36%
High n(107)	29%	39%	32%
VOTING			
None n(3)	0%	100%	0%
Low n(2)	0%	50%	50%
Medium n(32)	31%	25%	44%
High n(196)	31%	35%	35%

Notes:

1. Percentages are row percents.
2. K-means cluster analysis, 3 clusters, pairwise deletion of missing values.
3. Total n(232)

The Direction of Relationships

Although we lack strong relationships between most of our socialization variables and either the Panther sample or political engagement dimension variables we are able to analyze the direction of the relationships. The direction indicates

what characteristics the parents of our most highly engaged seniors tended to have. *While these findings are very tentative*, they offer suggestions to direct further research. Figure 6.4 presents the direction of the correlation coefficients associated with the relationship between a variety of socialization variables and both the Panthers and the political activity dimension. The political activity variable refers to levels of political activity ranging from none to high. One column includes the entire sample, the other excludes the Panthers for reasons to be discussed below. Pluses and minuses indicate only the direction of the relationship; they say nothing about the strength of the relationship. (Actual correlation coefficients are located in the Appendix.) The other two dimensions were not included to reduce redundancy.

**FIGURE 6.4: POSITIVE OR NEGATIVE CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS
AND SOCIALIZATION VARIABLES**

VARIABLES	PANTHERS	POLACT2	
		w/EP	w/o
<u>Baumrind</u>			
CONCEPT	+	+	+
DALOOF	+	-	-
DCOLD	-	-	-
DDEMAND	+	-	-
DINDEP	-	-	+
DLAX	+	+	+
DOVERPRO	+	+	-
DSTERN	-	-	-
DSTRESS	+	-	-
DSUPPORT	+	+	+
DWARM	-	+	+
MALOOF	+	-	-
MCOLD	+	+	-
MDEMAND	+	+	+
MINDEP	+	+	+
MLAX	+	-	+
MOVERPRO	-	-	-
MSTERN	+	+	-
MSTRESS	+	+	-
MSUPPORT	-	-	+
MWARM	-	-	+
PUNISH	-	+	+
RESPON	+	-	-
SOCIO	+	+	+
<u>Oliner</u>			
DADREAD	+	+	+
DADVOTE	-	-	+
DPOLACT	-	+	+
MOMREAD	+	+	+
MOMVOTE	-	-	+
MPOLACT	+	+	+
PARSREL	-	-	+
PARSVOL	-	+	+
<u>Hess & Torney</u>			
POWERDAD	-	-	-
POWERMOM	-	+	+

Notes:

1. Variables coded: 0. No, 1. Yes
2. Panthers coded: 0. No, 1. Yes
3. Dimension coded: 0. None, 1. Low, 2. Medium, 3. High

What makes Figure 6.4 so interesting is the profile that emerges concerning Panther parents. According to the literature, we expected Panthers to be the most likely to come from homes characterized as warm, supportive and demanding (according to Baumrind). We expected little punishment, great self-reliance (independence), altruistic and politically active role modeling by parents, lax discipline, and a strong religious commitment (according to Oliner).

According to the findings associated with the adjectives in Figure 6.4, we tend to find the opposite, especially where mothers are concerned. Early relationships with mothers are described by the majority as cold, aloof, demanding, nagging, stern and nonsupportive and generally -- stressful. Relationships with mothers are also described more favorably as independent and permissive and low on the power scale. Panthers are associated with politically active mothers who read political news but did not vote (although some mothers were suffragettes).

Panthers are less uniform in their descriptions of early relationship with their fathers. Associated adjectives are often contradictory as in permissive and overprotective, and neither warm nor cold. Generally, fathers were supportive, demanding, and aloof; relationships were stressful, but fathers were seen as low to moderately powerful. Panthers are not associated with politically active fathers or fathers that voted, but are associated with fathers who read political news.

While the traditional socialization literature led us to anticipate early assumption of responsibility, instead we found adult responsibilities tended to be assumed late in childhood. We expected and found low punishment levels. Panther parents were not particularly punitive. In keeping with the Chaffee section above, we also expected and found a positive SOCIO score (high level of social disharmony tolerated) and CONCEPT score (high level of open discussion encouraged). Panther parents were not particularly religious nor were they more likely to volunteer than other parents. The fact that Panthers had fewer deeply religious parents (40 percent) as opposed to Arlington's 55 percent and St Mary's 70 percent, and the fact that 35 percent of the Panthers were raised with no particular religion, helps to explain the high percentage of Panthers who presently claim no religious affiliation. No one was raised Unitarian.

These findings beg another question. Are these relationships Panther specific, or do they reflect characteristics of the entire sample? To answer this question, the political activity dimension variable is differentiated according to whether the correlation sign refers to the relationship between the independent variable and the entire sample or between the independent variable and sample without the Panthers. This lets us know whether or not the relationship is due to the heavy presence of Panthers at the upper end of the activity scale. However, when we exclude Panthers from the sample, we reduce our

sample size significantly because many non-Panthers failed to fill out the adjective section. Thus, findings are very tentative.

While Panthers came from homes where warm, caring behavior tended not to be the rule, the results are more favorable for highly active non-Panthers. The most active are associated with mothers who were demanding, and both parents additionally characterized as independent, permissive, supportive, warm, religious, frequent volunteers, and much more politically active. Surprisingly, we also find non-Panthers associated with more punitive parents and the perception of a more powerful mother. *By looking at only non-Panthers it becomes clear that many of the more negative characteristics are indeed Panther specific.* When Panthers are included in the sample, they skew the results for many variables. However, some variables, such as those associated with communication and responsibility, mirror the Panther sample.

The generally negative picture painted of Panther parents is a surprising and intriguing finding but not totally unexpected. While it runs counter to the socialization literature reviewed in Chapter Two, other evidence is available to help explain this contradiction. Harold Lasswell is famous for his description of "political man" who is typically an individual trying to compensate for an unconscious sense of damaged self-esteem resulting from earlier life experiences. His insecurity

is vented in a compulsion to exercise power which is then displaced onto the public arena and the resulting political activity is rationalized in terms of the public interest (Greenstein on Lasswell, 1977, xviii). However, Lasswell's theory is at odds with our finding that Panthers did not describe their parents as particularly powerful, and also runs counter to the finding that non-Panther activists had less stressful parent-child relationships.

The picture of parents as described by non-Panthers is warmer on the one hand, but more punitive on the other. The mixed picture we see of the parents of the most engaged reflects a point we made earlier in response to our Chaffee *non-findings*. It is encouraging to find that the politically engaged emerge from both the best and worst of family backgrounds. ***The question concerning whether Panthers, beyond this particular sample, tend to come from colder, more stressful home environments than their peers is one of the most interesting and unresolved issues of this study.***

Hypotheses

In connection with the third research question concerning childhood socialization we hypothesized that the following parental behaviors increase or decrease the potential for political engagement as a senior citizen. The evidence in this sample of seniors suggests the following:

(1) *Authoritative parenting increases, while authoritarian and permissive parenting decreases, the potential for future political engagement. This hypothesis is **not supported**.* If we look at the most engaged in each dimension we see a fairly even distribution across parent types. Only in the low engagement category of each dimension do we see any suggestion of a pattern. Those in the low activity range seem to be more inclined to come from an authoritarian home, but the differences are minimal. Although a slightly greater percentage of Panthers do come from authoritative homes, rather than authoritarian or permissive, the distribution is too even to support this hypothesis.

(2) *A pluralistic home environment increases, while a laissez-faire home environment decreases, the potential for future political engagement. This hypothesis is **supported in part**.* Data presented in conjunction with the Chaffee variables suggest that a pluralistic home environment is important, but not overly so. Eighty-seven percent of our Panthers did not come from such a home. Results suggest it is more important to differentiate between a pluralistic or nonpluralistic home than to know whether it is consensual, protective or laissez-faire. Those who did not come from a pluralistic home tended to be evenly divided between laissez-faire and consensual homes.

(3) *Altruistic role modeling increases, nonaltruistic role modeling decreases, the potential for future political*

engagement. *This hypothesis is **not supported**.* We find little correlation between variables measuring altruism (parents volunteering, modeling warmth, caring, and responsibility) and any engagement dimension variable or subsample.

(4) *Politically active role modeling increases, while politically inactive role modeling decreases, the potential for future political engagement. This hypothesis is **supported**.* The role of the politically active mother merits further investigation. Although numbers are small, the data do tentatively support this relationship. While Panthers tended not to have particularly active fathers, the sample as a whole, across every dimension, is associated with politically active mothers (and politically active fathers to a more limited extent).

(5) *Emphasis on religion increases, while no emphasis on religion decreases, the potential for future political engagement. This hypothesis is **not supported**.* In fact, our most politically engaged seniors, the Gray Panthers, are the least religious and many were raised that way. However, politically active non-Panthers are associated with religious parents. Thus, our findings are contradictory in this area.

(6) *Early assumption of responsibility increases, while late or no assumption of responsibility decreases, the potential for future political engagement. This hypothesis is **not supported**.* Panthers are associated with assuming responsibility late in

life. The sample as a whole is associated with assuming responsibility early in life. Statistically speaking, there is little to no relationship between the responsibility variable and political engagement.

(7) *Parental partisanship increases, while parental nonpartisanship decreases, the potential for future political engagement. This hypothesis is **not supported**.* There is little to no relationship between the partisanship variable and political engagement.

(8) *The perception of a powerful father increases, while the perception of a less powerful father decreases, the potential for future political engagement. This hypothesis is **supported in part**.* We find the power variable associated only with the voting dimension. As there are few nonvoters in our sample, these findings are very tentative.

In Sum

This chapter is significant for both its findings and non-findings. Specifically, its major **findings** include the following:

- (1) *Being raised in an urban/suburban area increases the likelihood of political engagement as a senior.*
- (2) *Perceiving a father as very powerful increases the likelihood that a senior will vote frequently to always.*

(3) A childhood political communication environment that encourages discussion increases the likelihood of political engagement as a senior.

(4) A politically active mother increases the likelihood of political engagement as a senior.

Conversely, the most significant **non-findings** include the following:

(1) Engaged seniors are slightly more likely to come from a pluralistic home than they are to come from a laissez-faire, consensual, or protective home.

(2) Engaged seniors are only slightly more likely to cluster with authoritative parents than they are to cluster with authoritarian or permissive parents.

(3) Panthers are **not** more likely to have been raised by parents characterized as warm, supportive, demanding, altruistic, religious and politically active. They are more likely than their peers to have had the opposite upbringing -- a parent-child relationship described as cold, nagging, stressful, demanding, nonaltruistic, nonreligious, with politically less active role models. However, data supporting these findings are tentative at best.

We will take the most significant of these variables into consideration in Chapter Eight, and use them to predict levels

of political engagement. However, we first need to return to the participation/engagement variables discussed initially in Chapter Three, and determine which variables are the most highly correlated with each dimension of political engagement. In Chapter Eight, we will combine these two sets of variables and regress the appropriate dimension on them.

Chapter Six Notes

1. Cluster Analysis allows the researcher to group sample cases according to certain characteristics. In this instance the computer was asked to create three "clusters" of cases according to their scores on four variables: PARSWARM, PCONTROL, RESPON, and POLCOMM. Cases were sorted by both residence and engagement dimension to create Figure 6.3.

2. The problem with these findings may be twofold: (a) highly sensitive questions, and (b) questions concerning the too distant past.

CHAPTER 7: FINDINGS: POLITICAL ENGAGEMENT VARIABLES

In Chapter Three we referenced Rosenstone and Hansen who argue that certain characteristics make people more or less likely to be the target of a political message, and second, to respond to that message. We differentiated those characteristics according to whether they referred to personal resources, social involvement, miscellaneous demographic or political variables. The literature suggests that these variables increase, decrease or do not affect levels of political activity, political attention or voting. Accordingly, we made certain predictions, which can be found in either Figure 3.2, or later in this chapter in Figure 7.1. The remainder of this chapter is an attempt to reconcile these predictions with the evidence provided by our sample data, and to take the most highly correlated variables and use them to predict levels of political engagement in Chapter Eight.

This Chapter also includes a subsection within the larger political activity section devoted to the Gray Panther sample. While the Panthers share many of the characteristics of the most politically active in our overall sample, there are some important differences.

In this chapter we want to differentiate the most from the least politically active and politically attentive, as well as

the most and least frequent voters. Like the procedures used in Chapter Six, each potential independent variable was correlated (using Kendall's tau) against first, political activity since age 60 [POLACT2], second, political attention since age 60 [POLATTN2], and third, voting activity since age 60 [VOTE2]. Each dimension is similarly coded: none (0), low (1), medium (2) and high (3). If the significance value (p) of the t test (two-tailed) was greater than .05, the variable was eliminated from further consideration. (A correlation table presenting the coefficients associated with each independent variable, and associated significance values, can be found in the Appendix.)

The variables which remained were explored more fully through contingency tables to determine the strength of the relationship. (Contingency tables for important predictors can be found in the Appendix.) We were interested primarily in identifying those variables which differentiated the most engaged from the least. As an example, although *only* high levels of education characterize the politically attentive, *both high and low* levels of education characterize the less attentive. Therefore, in terms of this sample, education is not a good predictor of political attention because it does not differentiate our sample with any accuracy.

Correlational data suggest a number of variables are *important to all three dimensions* of political engagement. Contingency tables support this relationship for the following

variables: group commitment [GROUP], political activity before and after sixty [POLACT1, POLACT2], and voting before and after sixty [VOTE1, VOTE2]. Thus, we can say as a prelude to our discussion of each dimension, that the greater the value of each of these variables, the greater the level of political activity, attention and voting. We also know from our discussion of continuity versus change in Chapter Five, that the variable most highly correlated with political activity after sixty is political activity before sixty; likewise political attention and voting activity after sixty is most highly correlated with political activity before sixty.

SECTION I: THE POLITICAL ACTIVITY DIMENSION

The political activity variable is the sum of six variables: working with others to solve community problems [COMPROB], personally contacting politicians [CONTACT], contributing money to parties, candidates and causes [MONEY], attending political meetings [MTGS], demonstrating on behalf of a cause [PROTEST], and working in election campaigns [WORK]. We call the sum of these variables before sixty [POLACT1] and the sum after sixty [POLACT2]. This section discusses variables as they relate to current levels of senior political activity [POLACT2]. When we divide our sample according to political

activity level, we find that 6 percent (20) of our sample is not active at all, 35 percent (116) have a low activity level, 27 percent (87) are moderately active, and 30 percent (96) are highly active. Thus, more than half the sample is at least moderately active. (For further details see the Variable List in the Appendix.)

Correlation coefficients and associated contingency tables suggest a closer look at the following variables:

- (a) **social involvement variables:** *group involvement [GROUP], friend participation [BUDSPA],*
- (b) **political orientation variables:** *political interest [POLINT1 & 2], internal efficacy [INTEFF], and ideology (folded) [PVFOLD].*
- (c) **political engagement dimension variables:** *pre-60 activity [POLACT1], pre-60 and post-60 attention [POLATTN1, POLATTN2], and pre-60 and post-60 voting [VOTE1, VOTE2].*

Social Involvement

Socially speaking, beyond the high group commitment mentioned earlier, we find 60 percent of our most active claim the majority of their friends are also politically active [BUDSPA]. Conversely, those who are not very active have few politically active friends.

Political Orientation Variables

The most politically active seniors have a high sense of internal efficacy [INTEFF]. Conversely, we find the majority of those with low internal efficacy fall into the low political activity category. Even those with a medium sense of internal efficacy fall into the same low political activity category. Thus, internal efficacy should be a good predictor of this engagement dimension.

As far as ideology [POLVIEW] is concerned, the value of this variable is limited by the fact that so many Panthers are extremely liberal. However, if we "fold" the variable [PVFOLD] so that strong ideologues on both ends of the scale are grouped together, we get a better sense of the relationship between ideology and political activity. When we look at the intensely ideological, 85 percent are either very or moderately active. Conversely, almost 50 percent of the nonideological fall into the none or low activity categories. Thus, a strong relationship exists especially for the most active.

Political Engagement Dimension Variables

The correlation between high attention before sixty [POLATTN1] and high activity after sixty is fairly strong. Of the most active, 95 percent were moderately or highly attentive before sixty. Conversely, 75 percent of the inactive and 80 percent of the not very active report low levels of attention

before sixty. The relationship between high attention levels and high activity levels is not as strong if we are referring to attention after sixty [POLATTN2]. While, generally speaking, the most active are the most attentive and the less active are less attentive, there is still a high percentage of inactives who are nonetheless very attentive.

The relationship between voting activity before and after sixty [VOTE1, VOTE2] and political activity after sixty is also fairly strong. Roughly 65 percent of the most frequent voters before and after sixty are moderately to highly active after sixty. Less frequent voters tend to fall into low or moderate political activity categories.

(See Chapter Five for a discussion concerning the relationship between political activity before sixty and political activity after sixty.)

Variables Notable for their Absence

As expected, education [EDUC] is not an important resource in terms of political activity because it fails to differentiate the most active from the least. While we can say that the most active tend to have higher levels of education, the least active are distributed evenly throughout our age education categories. The same can be said for civic duty [CDUTY], while the reverse can be said of political interest [POLINT]. While

low interest indicates little activity, high interest does not differentiate the highly active from the least active.

External efficacy [EXTEFF] is not related because those with the highest external efficacy fall equally into the least and most political activity categories. Surprisingly, more Arlington seniors report high external efficacy. Even the least active in Arlington seem to feel government is responsive to citizen action, even if they personally are not active. We will further discuss this non-finding below.

Other variables (about which we made predictions) that are *unrelated* to political activity (at least in this sample) include: age (over 60), free time, health, income, spouse's political activity level, years in the community, marriage, senior center attendance, sex, current residence or type of residence, partisanship (folded), and trust.

In Sum

At this point we can say that our most politically active seniors are characterized by: higher education, more politically active friends, high group commitment, a high sense of civic duty, high internal efficacy, strong ideology, high levels of political activity before sixty, and high levels of political attentiveness and voting activity before and after sixty.

The least active are characterized by: less group involvement, a low/moderate sense of internal efficacy,

low/medium attentiveness and slightly less frequent voting activity before and after sixty. However, the least active do not necessarily have little education, a low sense of civic duty, or less political interest.

SECTION IA: THE ACTIVITY DIMENSION AND THE PANTHER FACTOR

Using procedures similar to those described for our engagement dimensions as a whole, each potential independent variable was correlated (Kendall's tau) against first, a Gray Panther/non Gray Panther variable [MBRGP], second, an Arlington County/non-Arlington County variable [ARLRES], and third, a St Mary's/non-St Mary's variable [STMRES]. If the significance value of t test (two-tailed) was greater than .05, the variable was eliminated from further consideration. (A correlation table presenting the coefficients associated with each independent variable, and the associated significance values, can be found in the Appendix.)

The variables which remained were explored more fully through contingency tables to determine the strength of the relationship. While we were interested primarily in identifying those variables which differentiated the most engaged from the least in Section I, here we want to differentiate Panthers from

non-Panthers to determine whether Panther membership is significantly related to increased political engagement. Together, correlation coefficients and tables suggested a closer look at the following variables:

- (a) **personal resource variables:** age [AGE], education [EDUC], income [INCOME];
- (b) **social involvement variables:** group involvement [GROUP], membership in AARP [MBRAARP], living alone [LVALONE], marriage [MARRIAGE], family close by [FAMCLOSE], spouse and friend participation [SPOUSEPA, BUDSPA], religious participation variables [DENOMNOW, MASSREG, GODIMPT];
- (c) **other demographic variables:** sex [SEX];
- (d) **political orientation variables:** civic duty [CDUTY], political interest [POLINT1 & 2], efficacy [INTEFF, EXTEFF], partisanship [PID], ideology [POLVIEW], and trust [TRUST];
- (e) **political engagement dimension Variables:** activity [POLACT1 & 2], attention [POLATTN1 & 2], and voting [VOTE1 & 2].

It is interesting to note that while this list has much in common with the variables most closely related to the political activity dimension there are many additional variables when we select our samples based on group membership. For example, [AGE], [INCOME], [SEX], [MARRIAGE], external efficacy [EXTEFF] all emerge in this section as potentially important variables.

Personal Resource Variables

The [AGE] variable refers to the seniors in this sample only and therefore ranges from 60 up to 94. Undeterred by their years, the Panthers have the highest percentage (23 percent) in the oldest (81-100) category (as compared to Arlington's 19 percent, and St Mary's 11 percent). The St Mary's County and Gray Panthers samples both have a higher percentage in the mid-range (71-80) category (51 percent and 56 percent respectively) as compared to Arlington's 43 percent. The two counties have more in the youngest (61-70) category (38 percent) as compared to the Panther's 21 percent.

Panthers are typically not only older than their peers, they are better educated. The county samples are quite similar in education. More St Mary's County residents have no higher than a high school degree (20 percent) than the other respondents. Arlington and St Mary's County have roughly the same percentage of individuals with at least some college education (54 percent). Most surprisingly, *over 50 percent of the Gray Panthers have education beyond college and 90 percent of the Gray Panthers have education beyond High School.*

While Gray Panthers are clearly the most well educated, they are not the most well off financially. Fifty percent make between \$30,000 and \$50,000. Whereas the two county samples are roughly similar concerning this variable, with about 40 percent (in each case) making more than \$50,000 a year, the Gray

Panthers have only 15 percent in that category. Clearly, in terms of political participation, more income does not necessarily mean more participation (perhaps because retirement income is not a true reflection of income or status levels achieved during the earlier, working years).

Social Involvement Variables

The participation values of friends and one's spouse are as expected. Panthers are much more likely to call the majority of their friends "politically active," (56 percent as opposed to Arlington's 15 percent and St Mary's 10 percent) and of those with living spouses, the spouses are also more likely to be "politically active" (28 percent as opposed to Arlington's 12 percent and St Mary's 20 percent).

Three related variables, marriage [MARRIED], whether one lives alone [LVALONE], and family close by [FAMCLOSE] help to differentiate our St Mary's County residents from Arlington County residents and Panthers. More St Mary's County residents are currently married (70 percent as compared to 37 percent and 45 percent), do not live alone (76 percent do not as compared to 53 percent and 59 percent, respectively), and have family close by (85 percent as compared to 73 percent for both).

As we noted in Chapter Four, the religion variables concerning denomination [DENOMNOW], how regularly one attends church [MASSREG], and the importance of God in one's life

[GODIMPT], point out some glaring differences between subsamples. *Almost half* (42 percent) of the Gray Panthers claim no religious affiliation as compared to Arlington's 15 percent and St Mary's 8 percent. The two county samples are predominantly Protestant (Arlington 40 percent, St Mary's 58 percent) and Catholic (Arlington 40 percent, St Mary's 28 percent). Panthers who do claim a religious affiliation are 19 percent Protestant, 4 percent Catholic, 18 percent Jewish and 15 percent Unitarian. Surprisingly, Arlington County also has a high percentage of Unitarians in its sample (10 percent). Those who claim a religious affiliation also tend to go to church regularly, across all three samples.

The large percentage of Unitarians is not surprising in light of its association with a liberal interpretation of religion and its frequent involvement in political debates. Likewise, members of the Jewish community tend to be more socially liberal than their Protestant and Catholic peers.

The importance of God in *crisis* life [GODIMPT] variable is included along with the denomination variable to capture those who believe in God but may reject the ritual associated with organized religion. *In fact, over half of the Panthers (58 percent) say God is not important to them at all -- an amazing finding, given the extent of religiosity in America.* These numbers are very different for the other two samples. A corresponding seven percent of St Mary's and 14 percent of

Arlington County residents feel God is not important to them at all. At the other end of the scale, 29 percent of the Panthers, 76 percent of St Mary's and 55 percent of Arlington County residents feel God is "very important" to them.

Not surprisingly, since all are group members by definition, more Gray Panthers (68 percent) score high on the GROUP variable (the sum of group membership and group leadership before and after 60) than residents in the two counties (Arlington 44 percent, St Mary's 58 percent). The percentages in the medium range, however, are more even -- Panthers 24 percent, Arlington 29 percent, and St Mary's 28 percent -- suggesting that the difference is the level of commitment. Panthers are more likely to not only belong to a group before and after 60, but also to hold office in that group.¹

A corresponding variable, membership in AARP [MBRAARP], shows Panthers less likely to belong (72 percent are members) than residents in the two counties (Arlington 82 percent, St Mary's 84 percent). Conversations with seniors suggest that Panthers belong to AARP more strictly for group benefits unrelated to politics (such as travel benefits) and consider AARP simply a "business." Non-Panthers see AARP not only as a source for "good deals," but also as their political lobbying group actively protecting their interests in Washington, and thus, greater numbers belong because they have two reasons to do so.

Other Demographic Variables

While the St Mary's County sample mirrors the national sample almost exactly (39 percent men, 61 percent women) in terms of total males and females, both the Arlington County (31 percent men, 69 percent women) and Gray Panther samples (20 percent men, 80 percent women) have more women than the national sample.

Political Orientation Variables

There are significant differences in party identification between Panthers and the other county samples. Seventy-five percent of the Panthers are Democrats as compared to the two counties where roughly 45 percent are Democrats. There are similar numbers of Independents across all three samples -- Panthers have 18 percent, Arlington has 17 percent, and St Mary's has 12 percent. However, only 2 percent of the Panthers call themselves Republican as compared to Arlington's 37 percent and St Mary's 43 percent.

The Arlington county sample is more liberal than the St Mary's county sample (40 percent to 27 percent) but both counties have a large, roughly equal, moderate core (31 percent). Conversely, St Mary's county is more conservative than St Mary's (42 percent to 29 percent). The Gray Panthers, however, are almost exclusively self-described liberals (88 percent); most of the remainder are moderates (10 percent).

Panthers exhibit the strongest sense of civic duty [CDUTY]. Seventy-nine percent of Panthers scored high in comparison to Arlington's 56 percent and St Mary's 38 percent. Surprisingly, with few exceptions, the remainder of each sample fell in the medium category (Panthers 20 percent, Arlington 40 percent, St Mary's 57 percent) suggesting a strong sense of civic duty throughout the entire sample.

The two efficacy variables are interesting, especially since external efficacy [EXTEFF] correlates highly with only one county sample. In fact, levels of internal efficacy [INTEFF] were very similar across all three subsamples. Seven percent of Panthers have a low sense of internal efficacy as compared to Arlington's 13 percent and St Mary's 15 percent. More similarly, 52 percent of Panthers have a medium sense of internal efficacy as compared to both Arlington's and St Mary's 58 percent. However, more Panthers have a high sense of internal efficacy (41 percent) as compared to Arlington's 31 percent and St Mary's 26 percent. Thus, Panthers tend to feel more confident in their ability to understand politics and to practice politics than do their peers.

External efficacy [EXTEFF], on the other hand, refers to confidence in government's responsiveness to one's actions. We expected Panthers to have high external efficacy levels along with their high internal efficacy levels but the data do not support this expectation. Instead, Arlington County residents

have the highest level of external efficacy (32 percent) as compared to the Panthers' 18 percent and St Mary's 13 percent. Like internal efficacy, medium levels were very similar across samples -- Arlington 52 percent, St Mary's 60 percent, and Panthers' 63 percent. St Mary's seniors have the lowest sense of external efficacy (27 percent) as compared to Arlington's 17 percent and the Panthers' 20 percent.

The negative value associated with the correlation between the trust [TRUST] and Gray Panther variables reflects the fact that Panthers are more likely to have *no trust* than seniors in the other two samples. Forty-six percent cited no confidence in politicians at any level of government. However, percentages associated with low trust are nearly identical across samples (Panthers 21 percent, Arlington 23 percent, St Mary's 20 percent). Generally, Arlington residents are the most trusting, followed by St Mary's, and finally Panthers. The low trust associated with Panthers is surprising in light of their liberal ideology. We tend to think of liberals as quite optimistic about life in general and government in particular (Baradat, 1991, 29). (The association between low trust and high efficacy that we expected for the Panthers is generally supported by these data except that the efficacy seems to be specifically *internal*.)

As expected, Panthers were more politically interested than their peers before age sixty [POLINT1] and that trend continues

after sixty [POLINT2]. However, the percentages are high for all three subsamples. Ninety-two percent of Panthers were highly interested before sixty as compared to Arlington's 81 percent and St Mary's 69 percent. After sixty, those indicating high interest increases across samples: Panthers 97 percent, Arlington 81 percent, and St Mary's 87 percent.

Political Engagement Dimension Variables

As expected, we find Panthers more highly active than their peers before and after sixty. Before sixty, 70 percent of the Panthers were highly active as compared to Arlington's 20 percent and St Mary's 17 percent. However, after sixty, although Panther activity stays high, those percentages decrease for each sample by roughly 5 percent (65 percent, 16 percent and 12 percent, respectively).

This decline was not evident in voting, except for Panthers. Before sixty, 94 percent of the Panthers voted in all types of elections as compared to Arlington's 61 percent and St Mary's 55 percent. After sixty, although Panther voting levels stay high, their percentage decreases slightly, while county percentages increase (94 percent, 61 percent and 55 percent, respectively).

The political attention variable is also interesting in terms of change over time. Before sixty, 50 percent of Panthers are highly, 42 percent moderately, and 8 percent not very

attentive. After sixty, the numbers change little; 48 percent highly, 44 percent moderately, and 6 percent not very attentive. However, the seniors in the two county samples become much more attentive after sixty.

Variables Notable For Their Absence

Important **unrelated** variables include: birth order, free time, health, and years living in community.

Despite the fact that many county residents were contacted by the author through senior recreation centers, the percentages for frequency of attendance at those centers [RECCTR] is surprisingly similar across the three samples. St Mary's County residents are the least likely to go at all (34 percent) followed by Panthers (20 percent) and Arlington residents (14 percent). Panthers and St Mary's residents are equally likely to go occasionally (33 percent) as compared to Arlington's 23 percent. Arlington residents are most likely to go frequently (58 percent) followed by Panthers (42 percent) and St Mary's (32 percent). Very few in any subsample go daily (Panthers and Arlington 5 percent, St Mary's 2 percent). The fact that St Mary's County residents are least likely to go to recreation centers can be partially explained by the greater distances between seniors and centers in the country versus the city. In addition, more St Mary's residents are married and have family close by which may reduce the need for center attendance.

In Sum

In comparison with the two county samples, Gray Panthers exhibit a variety of unique characteristics. It is useful to distinguish between those characteristics which are as predicted and those that come as a complete surprise. **As expected, Panthers,** in comparison with non-Panthers, tend to be politically active at an older age and to be better educated. They are more likely to call the majority of their friends politically active, have politically active spouses, and be very involved in group activity. Panthers are almost exclusively self-proclaimed liberals and most are also Democrats as were their parents. They have a greater sense of internal efficacy and civic duty, they have been more highly interested and engaged in politics over time, and they have less trust in the political system to "do what's right" than do their non-Panther counterparts.

Unexpectedly, Panthers tend to have lower incomes than the other seniors in the sample. The religion findings -- almost half claim no religious affiliation and over half do not consider God important to them at all -- are the most significant surprise because they run so counter to what the socialization literature suggested. Also surprisingly, variables most noticeable for their absence are external efficacy, free time, health, and years in the community.

Both county groups tend to be younger, less well-educated, and better off financially. More **St Mary's County** residents are married, living with someone, and have family close by. Fewer go to recreation centers. St Mary's County sample mirrors the national sample almost exactly (39 percent men, 61 percent women) in terms of total males and females. Both the Arlington County (31 percent men, 69 percent women) and Gray Panther samples (20 percent men, 80 percent women) have more women than the national sample. **Arlington residents** were twice as likely as either of the other two samples to feel high external efficacy. As we mentioned in Chapter Three, both Arlington and St Mary's Counties contain a high percentage of government workers. This factor helps to explain the higher education levels, income, interest, and tendency to participate we see in these samples as compared to the ANES sample.

SECTION II: THE POLITICAL ATTENTION DIMENSION

The political attention variable is the sum of four variables: listening to political talk radio [LISTEN], reading political news [READ], watching television news [TVNEWS] and watching television political shows [TVSHOW]. We call the sum of these variables before sixty [POLATTN1] and the sum after sixty [POLATTN2]. This section discusses variables as they

relate to current levels of senior political attention [POLATTN2]. When we divide our sample according to political attention level, we find that most are moderately to highly attentive. Less than 1 percent (2) of our sample is not attentive at all, 12 percent (39) are not very attentive, 46 percent (146) are moderately attentive, and 41 percent (131) are highly attentive. (For further details see the Variable List in the Appendix.)

Of our study variables, fewer are both highly correlated with and allow us to distinguish between levels of activity within this dimension than for the other two engagement dimensions. This section takes a closer look at the following:

- (a) **personal resource variables:** *health [HEALTH];*
- (b) **social involvement variables:** *group involvement [GROUP];*
- (c) **other demographic variables:** *residence [LVNOW];*
- (d) **political orientation variables:** *civic duty [CDUTY], and political interest [POLINT1 & 2];*
- (e) **political engagement dimension variables:** *activity [POLACT1 & 2], attention [POLATTN1], and voting [VOTE1 & 2].*

Personal Resources

While not highly correlated to either our Panthers/non-Panthers, or political activity dimension, the health variable [HEALTH] emerges in this dimension. We expect the most attentive to be the poorest in health because they are the most

likely to be confined to their home. In fact, this expectation is supported by the data, but there are so few in the sample (2 percent) in "poor" health, or even "fair" health (13 percent) that the finding is very tentative. Additionally, 85 percent of the entire sample falls into the two highest attentiveness categories. Those caveats in mind, those in poor health fall exclusively into the two highest attentiveness categories; those in fair health fall primarily into the two highest attentiveness categories; and those in good/excellent health are more likely to fall into the low attentiveness categories. Thus, while a relationship seems to exist, it is not a strong one, and due to the small number of individuals involved, it is a very tentative one. At most, we can say that those in poor/fair health are likely to be moderately to highly attentive. Those in good/excellent health are more likely to include a percentage of individuals who are not particularly attentive.

Social Involvement

Beyond the high correlation with the group variable, discussed at the beginning of this chapter, no other variables are important predictors in this category. Unlike previous samples, the number of politically active friends [BUDSPA] is not important. While the least attentive are characterized by

few active friends, the most active are not necessarily characterized by a majority of politically active friends.

Other Demographics

Generally speaking, respondents currently living in suburban/urban areas [LVNOW] seem to be slightly more attentive than those living in rural/small town areas. Of the most attentive, 24 percent live in a small town, 6 percent in a large town, 55 percent in the suburbs, and 40 percent in the city. Of the least attentive, 3 percent (1 person) live in a rural area, 31 percent in small town, 49 percent in the suburbs, and 18 percent in the city. This may be due to the fact that fewer St Mary's county residents live alone (and/or may be in better health), and political radio and television may be more accessible in the city. Thus, although a relationship exists, it is a weak one.

Political Orientation Variables

We find that the higher one's sense of civic duty [CDUTY], the higher the political attentiveness. Those with the highest sense of civic duty fall primarily into the two highest attentiveness categories (45 percent moderately, 48 percent highly attentive). Those with the lowest sense of civic duty fall primarily into lower attentiveness categories (40 percent low, 40 percent moderately attentive).

Not surprisingly, the most politically interested [POLINT1, POLINT2] are also the most attentive, before and after sixty. However, the picture is more complicated when we look at the least interested. Before sixty, over half of the least interested were also moderately attentive. After sixty, the least interested are spread across attention levels. Thus, like we saw in the political activity dimension, while high interest characterizes the highly attentive, low interest does not necessarily characterize those less attentive.

Political Engagement Dimension Variables

Also not surprisingly, both political activity before and after sixty [POLACT1, POLACT2] are highly correlated to political attention after sixty. Ninety-three percent of the most politically active before sixty and 98 percent of the most politically active after sixty are moderately or highly attentive after sixty! Conversely, political inactives tend to be inattentive (60 percent before sixty, 45 percent after sixty). However, even a low activity level (before or after sixty) dramatically increases attentiveness. Similarly, 93 percent of the most frequent voters before and after sixty are moderately or highly attentive after sixty, as compared to the roughly 75 percent of less frequent voters (before and after sixty) who are moderately or highly attentive after sixty.

(See Chapter Five for a discussion concerning the relationship between political attention before sixty and political attention after sixty.)

Variables Notable For Their Absence

As we saw in the political activity dimension, the education variable is higher among the most attentive, but it does not differentiate our sample very well. The same can be said of having many politically active friends.

Variables (about which we made predictions) that are unrelated to political attention (at least in this sample) include: age (over 60), free time, income, spouse's political activity level, years in the community, marriage, senior center attendance, sex, type of residence, ideology and partisanship (folded), efficacy, and trust.

In Sum

For this sample, the most attentive seniors are characterized by: at least some college education, high group commitment, a current suburban/urban residence, a high sense of civic duty, and high political attentiveness before sixty, high levels of political interest, political activity, and voting activity before and after sixty, and being raised in an urban area. Of those in poor/fair health, most are moderately to highly attentive.

Conversely, the least attentive are characterized by: lower group commitment, a current rural/small town residence, a lower sense of civic duty, low political attentiveness before sixty, and low levels of political interest, political activity, and voting activity before and after sixty. The least active are not necessarily characterized by less education or fewer politically active friends.

SECTION III: THE VOTING DIMENSION

The voting variable is the sum of three variables: voting in local and/or state elections [VOTLOC], voting in national elections [VOTNAT], and voting in primaries and/or caucuses [VOTPRIM]. We call the sum of these variables before sixty [VOTE1] and the sum after sixty [VOTE2]. This section discusses variables as they relate to current levels of senior voting activity [VOTE2]. Not surprisingly, when we divide our sample according to voting activity level, we find that most are indeed "voting specialists." Just over 1 percent (4) of our sample does not vote at all, less than 1 percent (2) seldom vote, 27 percent (85) vote often, and 71 percent (227) vote regularly in all types of elections. (For further details see the Variable List in the Appendix.) Thus, this is the most difficult dimension to draw conclusions about because the distribution

across categories is so skewed. There is little variation across our voting categories, and most individuals fall at only one end of the scale. We must constantly keep in mind that only six seniors report never or seldom voting. We are basing most of these findings on variations between those who vote frequently versus always.

Based on the coefficients and table data, variables which distinguish between voting levels the best, despite the lack of variation, include the following:

- (a) **personal resource variables:** education [EDUC];
- (b) **social involvement variables:** group involvement [GROUP], friend participation [BUDSPA], years in community [LVYRS];
- (c) **political engagement dimension variables:** activity [POLACT1 & 2], and voting [VOTE1].

Personal Resources

Of the most frequent voters, 86 percent have at least some college education [EDUC]. The few nonvoters fall into the lower education categories. The direction of the relationship is supported by the evidence but because of the nature of this sample the strength of the relationship is diminished.

Social Involvement

Closely corresponding to the group variable, we also see that the political participation of friends [BUDSPA] increases

voting activity. Of the 81 seniors with a majority of politically active friends all vote either frequently or always. However, even those with few to no politically active friends vote frequently if not always.

Despite the problems associated with the voting activity data (the lack of variation) a relationship between voting and years in community [LVYRS] is evident. Almost all of the nonvoters fall into the "less than five years" category. We generally find that the greater the years, the greater the tendency to vote.

Political Engagement Dimension Variables

Remembering that most of our seniors fall into the top two voting activity levels, we can say that roughly 90 percent of the most politically active before and after sixty [POLACT1, POLACT2] fall into the highest voting category. Conversely, while 85 percent of the least active also vote frequently, a greater percentage of these seniors fall into the lower of the top two voting categories.

(See Chapter Five for a discussion concerning the relationship between voting activity before sixty and voting activity after sixty.)

Variables Notable For Their Absence

We find that the higher one's sense of civic duty [CDUTY], the higher the voting frequency. Those with the highest sense of civic duty fall primarily into the highest voting category (87 percent). However, those with the lowest sense of civic duty fall primarily into the next highest voting category, and low voters are distributed throughout the range of civic duty categories. Thus, this relationship is a weak one. While we can say that the most frequent voters tend to have a high sense of civic duty, we cannot say that infrequent voters have a low sense of civic duty.

As we saw in the other two dimensions, the most politically interested are also the most frequent voters, before and after sixty. Of the most frequent voters, 87 percent were also the most interested before sixty, and 92 percent are the most interested after sixty. For those who vote less frequently, we see slightly less interest, before and after sixty. However, our few nonvoters are evenly divided between low interest and high interest! Thus, while high interest characterizes the most frequent voters, low interest does not necessarily characterize infrequent voters.

And finally, tables for the attention dimension variables [POLATTN1, POLATTN2] show that those who vote most frequently are not necessarily the most attentive. Of those who vote most frequently, the majority (54 percent) were only moderately

attentive before sixty. However, the numbers of attentive seniors rose after sixty and accordingly, of those who vote most frequently, the majority (47 percent) are also the most attentive. Infrequent voters are as likely to claim high attentiveness as low attentiveness. Thus, although the relationship between voting and political attention after sixty is not a strong one, it is, in fact, stronger than that of voting and political attention before sixty.

Variables (about which we made predictions) that are unrelated to voting (at least in this sample) include: age (over 60), free time, health, income, spouse's political activity level, marriage, senior center attendance, sex, type and location of residence, ideology and partisanship (folded), efficacy, and trust.

In Sum

For this sample, the most frequent voters are characterized by: higher levels of education and group activity, a higher number of politically active friends, more years in the community, a higher sense of civic duty, high levels of voting activity before sixty, and high levels of political interest and political activity before and after sixty. The most frequent voters are not necessarily the most attentive, especially attention levels before sixty.

The reverse is generally true of less frequent voters: lower levels of education, group activity, and less activity before and after sixty. Less frequent voters are not necessarily lower in their sense of civic duty or level of political interest.

Conclusion

Figure 7.1 presents a summary of what we expected versus what we found. The expected column contains our hypotheses. For example, concerning the age variable, we expected that higher levels of age would be associated with higher levels of voting and attention but not activity beyond voting. We find instead no relationship (NR) between increased age and any dimension. Surprisingly we also found no relationship between free time and any of our dimensions despite the fact that Brady et al. (1995) found free time affected certain labor intensive political activities such as solving community problems or working in election campaigns. We can only speculate that these findings do not support the Brady findings because our measure for free time is not as accurate, or because this sample is entirely made up of seniors who are generally decreasing their most active forms of involvement in politics despite their relative amounts of free time.

Similarly, we expected that higher levels of civic duty would be associated with higher levels of voting and attention

but would not be associated with higher levels of political activity beyond voting. What we find for civic duty is that although higher levels of civic duty do characterize the most engaged in the activity and voting dimensions, it does not distinguish (DD) between the most engaged and the least. In terms of attention, however, civic duty is a potentially important predictor. As predicted, higher levels are associated with greater voting frequency, and lower levels are associated with lesser voting frequency.

Variables which are the best predictors will be used in Chapter Eight to help predict their respective dimension of political engagement.

FIGURE 7.1: TESTING OUR HYPOTHESES: EXPECTED VS OBSERVED

Variable... (lo to hi)	VOTING		ACTIVITY		ATTENTION	
	EXPECTED	SUPPORTED	EXPECTED	SUPPORTED	EXPECTED	SUPPORTED
<u>Personal Resources</u>						
age	increase	NO (NR)	no change	YES (NR)	increase	NO (NR)
education	no change	INCREASE	no change	YES (DD)	no change	YES (DD)
free time	increase	NO (NR)	no change	YES (NR)	increase	NO (NR)
health	no change	YES (NR)	increase	NO (NR)	decrease	YES
income	no change	YES (NR)	no change	YES (NR)	no change	YES (NR)
<u>Social Involvement</u>						
active friends	increase	YES	increase	YES	increase	YES (DD)
active spouse	increase	NO (NR)	increase	NO (NR)	increase	NO (NR)
community yrs	increase	YES	no change	YES (NR)	increase	NO (NR)
group mbrship	increase	YES	increase	YES	increase	YES

Variable... (lo to hi)	VOTING		ACTIVITY		ATTENTION	
	EXPECTED	SUPPORTED	EXPECTED	SUPPORTED	EXPECTED	SUPPORTED
marriage	increase	NO (NR)	increase	NO (NR)	increase	NO (NR)
senior center	increase	NO (NR)	increase	NO (NR)	increase	NO (NR)

Other Demographics

sex	no change	YES (NR)	no change	YES (NR)	no change	YES (NR)
ST to urban	increase	NO (NR)	increase	NO (NR)	increase	YES
residence	increase	NO (NR)	increase	NO (NR)	unknown	NR

Political Orientation Variables

civic duty	increase	YES (DD)	no change	INCREASE (DD)	increase	YES
ideology (F)	increase	NO (NR)	increase	YES	increase	NO (NR)
party ID (F)	increase	NO (NR)	increase	NO (NR)	increase	NO (NR)
internal eff.	increase	NO (NR)	increase	YES	unknown	NR
external eff.	increase	NO (NR)	increase	NO (NR)	unknown	NR
pol. activity						
- before 60	increase	YES	increase	YES	increase	YES
- after 60	increase	YES	NA		increase	YES
pol. attention						
- before 60	increase	YES (DD)	increase	YES	increase	YES
- after 60	increase	YES (DD)	increase	YES	NA	
pol. interest						
- before 60	increase	YES (DD)	increase	YES (DD)	increase	YES
- after 60	increase	YES (DD)	increase	YES (DD)	increase	YES
trust	no change	YES (NR)	no change	YES (NR)	decrease	NO (NR)
low trust						
+ high eff.	increase	NO (NR)	increase	YES	increase	NO (NR)
voting activity						
- before 60	increase	YES	increase	YES	increase	YES
- after 60	NA		increase	YES	increase	YES

NOTE:

NR = NOT RELATED STATISTICALLY, DD = DOESN'T DISTINGUISH (POOR PREDICTOR)

Based on the information summarized in Figure 7.1, the potentially best predictors of political activity after sixty are current levels of social involvement (politically active friends and group commitment), personal self-confidence, ideological intensity, along with the political engagement dimension variables (past and present). None of these predictors is particularly unexpected. Rather, it is the variables not present that constitute the greatest surprise -- particularly the absence of external efficacy.

The best predictors of political attention after sixty may be current levels of civic duty, health, where the senior lives now, and political interest, in addition to the political engagement dimension variables. It is interesting that *civic duty* is more closely associated with this dimension than it is to voting or political activity beyond voting. Rosenstone and Hansen, for example, find civic duty a good predictor of voting but not activity beyond voting. These findings suggest the need for further research on the relationship between political attention and civic duty. The relationship between health and attention is as expected. We predicted that those with poorer health would be most likely to "tune into" political news. We also expected health to be poorly related to voting.

The potentially best predictors of voting activity after sixty are current levels of education, social involvement (politically active friends and group commitment), and years in

the community, in addition to the political engagement dimension variables (with the exception of political attention). Again, this list is most notable for what it does not include, such as efficacy and partisanship.

We know considerably more about our seniors now than we did at the beginning of the study. In the next chapter we will use the variables identified as important in this chapter, along with those identified in Chapter Six, to try and predict the various dimensions of political engagement. There we will get a better sense of the relative merit of these variables. And finally, in Chapter Nine we will bring together what we have learned in the study as a whole.

CHAPTER 8: PREDICTING DIMENSIONS OF POLITICAL ENGAGEMENT

Our fourth research question asks: *Which of the variables we are studying are the most important for distinguishing between the most engaged and the least engaged senior citizens?* This chapter takes the findings of the three previous chapters and uses them to predict dimensions of political engagement. Using ordinary least squares regression, we combine the variables identified as the most important in Chapters Six and Seven, along with "dimension variables" discussed in Chapter Five and use them to predict dimensions of political engagement (activity, attention and voting) to determine the relative importance of each variable. We anticipate that our few key socialization variables will be able to hold their own against the more usual participation variables.

By "dimension variables" we mean those variables which refer to political activity, political attention and voting before and after sixty. We call a pre-60 dimension variable a "core dimension variable" when it is included in a regression equation with its post-60 counterpart as dependent variable (DV). Thus, political activity before sixty [POLACT1] is the core dimension variable when the DV is political activity after sixty [POLACT2], political attention before sixty [POLATTN1] is the core dimension variable when the DV is political attention

after sixty [POLATTN2], and voting before sixty [VOTE1] is the core dimension variable when the DV is voting after sixty [VOTE2]. These dimension variables can also be referred to as adult socialization variables because they reflect our findings regarding continuity versus change discussed in Chapter Five.

Based on previous findings, the potentially best predictors by dimension include the following variables:

- (a) Political Activity (after sixty): politically active friends, group involvement, internal efficacy, political activity before sixty, political attention before and after sixty, political communication, area raised, ideology (folded), and voting before and after sixty.
- (b) Political Attention (after sixty): civic duty, group involvement, health, area individual lives, political activity before and after sixty, political attention before sixty, political communication, political interest before and after sixty, area raised, and voting before and after sixty.
- (c) Voting Activity (after sixty): politically active friends, education, expressing opinions, group involvement, years in community, political activity before and after sixty, perception of father's power, area raised, and voting before sixty.

Regression

By regressing the appropriate dimension on the variables listed above, we can explain a certain amount of variation in our engagement measure. One of the goals of using socialization variables in this study is to see if we can better explain variation in levels of political engagement by including them along with the more "usual" participation variables. Thus, this section will gradually add variables to a basic regression equation that contains the "usual" participation variables to demonstrate the impact of various groups of variables or individual variables on our ability to predict dimensions of political engagement. By evaluating the impact of various blocks of variables, we can decide on the best predictive model for each dimension of political engagement in our study. The best model will be chosen based upon how much variation in the dependent variable is explained and how well the variables work with one another.

The second model adds childhood socialization variables such as our political communication construct [POLCOMM] and the area in which an individual was raised [PSLIVE] to the basic predictive model. The third model adds pre-60 dimension variables; the fourth model adds post-60 dimension variables. In the third and fourth models we leave out the core independent dimension variable (for reasons discussed below).

And finally, in the last model, we regress the appropriate dimension on all the predictors discussed above.

Model 1: Regression with the "Usual Suspects"

If we want to see how much better we can explain variation in levels of political engagement by including socialization variables along with the usual participation variables, we must first use only the participation variables to give us a baseline for comparison. Figure 8.1 illustrates the predictive ability of only those usual suspects identified as important in Chapter Seven.

Column 1 presents the results of a regression equation in which the independent variables representing an individual's number of politically active friends [BUDSPA], group involvement [GROUP], internal efficacy [INTEFF], and ideology folded [PVFOLD] are regressed upon the dependent variable political activity after sixty [POLACT2]. The equation is as follows:

Basic Predictive Model for Political Activity After Sixty:

$$POLACT2 = BUDSPA + GROUP + INTEFF + PVFOLD$$

Based upon the beta coefficients and significance tests of these four variables, they are all extremely good predictors. Together they explain roughly 40 percent of the variation in political activity after sixty. When added to these four

variables, we hope our socialization variables will significantly improve upon this percentage.

Of these four variables, the best predictor (for this particular sample of seniors) is the number of politically active friends [BUDSPA]. The next best predictor is group involvement [GROUP]. Internal efficacy [INTEFF] and ideology folded [PVFOLD] are tied for third place. However, the size of their coefficients suggest that all are important predictors in their own right. The positive sign associated with each suggests that as these variables increase in value (i.e., more friends, more group involvement, a greater sense of internal efficacy and stronger ideology), activity increases. In light of the large percentage of Panthers in this sample (who tend to fall on the high end of the political activity scale), these findings are not surprising. Their heavy group involvement is evident here, as is their strong feeling of internal efficacy and ideological intensity.

In a similar vein, Column 2 presents the results of a regression equation in which the independent variables civic duty [CDUTY], group involvement [GROUP], health [HEALTH], area living now [LVNOW] and political interest before and after sixty [POLINT1, POLINT2] are regressed upon the dependent variable political attention after sixty [POLATTN2]. The equation is as follows:

Basic Predictive Model for Political Attention After Sixty:

$$POLATTN2 = CDUTY + GROUP + HEALTH + LVNOW + POLINT1 + POLINT2$$

Of these six variables, the best predictor by far is political interest after sixty [POLINT2]. It is much more important than political interest before sixty [POLINT1]. The rest are roughly equal in importance except for civic duty [CDUTY] which is the weakest predictor. The negative sign associated with the health variable indicates (not surprisingly) that as health decreases, attention increases. For the remaining variables, as they increase in value, attention also increases.

The size of the independent variable coefficients suggests that all are important predictors. However, the significance tests associated with group involvement and political interest before sixty suggest that the size of the beta coefficients may be overstated. Together, these six variables explain roughly 30 percent of the variation in political attention after sixty.

In Column 3 we see the results of a regression equation in which the independent variables -- number of politically active friends [BUDSPA], education [EDUC], group involvement [GROUP], and years in the community [LVYRS] are regressed upon the dependent variable voting after sixty [VOTE2]. The equation is as follows:

Basic Predictive Model for Voting Activity After Sixty:

$$VOTE2 = BUDSPA + EDUC + GROUP + LVYRS$$

Of these four variables, the best predictors are politically active friends and years in the community. The strength of the latter is not surprising considering that voter registration requires residency, time, and the knowledge of how and where to register. Education and group involvement are not as important. That education emerged as important in this dimension, as opposed to the political activity dimension, is surprising in light of the fact that Panthers are, as a whole, better educated than their peers. The positive sign associated with each variable suggests that as each increases in value, voting also increases.

The size of the independent variable coefficients suggest all are important predictors. Together they explain roughly 20 percent of the variation in political attention after sixty. However, the voting dimension variables are both notable for their lack of variation. Most of the seniors in this sample voted frequently or always. Thus, this low percentage is not surprising because differentiating between seniors is most difficult in this dimension.

FIGURE 8.1: PREDICTING DIMENSIONS OF POLITICAL ENGAGEMENT
USING STANDARD PARTICIPATION VARIABLES

<i>Political Activity</i>			<i>Political Attention</i>			<i>Voting</i>		
	<i>beta</i>	<i>sig T</i>		<i>beta</i>	<i>sig T</i>		<i>beta</i>	<i>sig T</i>
<u>Model 1</u>								
BUDSPA	.38	.0000	CDUTY	.06	.0025	BUDSPA	.24	.0000
GROUP	.25	.0000	GROUP	.15	.2081	EDUC	.11	.0401
INTEFF	.17	.0002	HEALTH	-.12	.0124	GROUP	.15	.0056
PVFOLD	.18	.0001	LVNOW	.13	.0047	LVYRS	.26	.0000
			POLINT1	.11	.0470			
			POLINT2	.37	.0000			
<i>R Square = .41</i>			<i>R Square = .31</i>			<i>R Square = .20</i>		
<i>Adjusted R Sq = .40</i>			<i>Adjusted R Sq = .29</i>			<i>Adjusted R Sq = .19</i>		
<i>Durbin Watson = 1.93</i>			<i>Durbin Watson = 1.95</i>			<i>Durbin Watson = 1.82</i>		

Note: Method ENTER, pairwise deletion of missing data.

Model 2: Adding Childhood Socialization Variables

At this point we add our block of childhood socialization variables into the appropriate basic model and hope that values associated with their beta coefficients are high while associated significance tests are low, and that the difference in the R Square value between that in Figure 8.1 and Figure 8.2 is significantly higher.

In terms of political activity after sixty, adding the socialization variables -- political communication [POLCOMM] and area raised [PSLIVE] -- increases our overall predictive ability by only two percent (40 percent to 42 percent). Both

have good beta coefficients and they seem to be roughly equivalent to internal efficacy and ideology (folded) in strength. Both are positive, suggesting that the better the communication environment as a child, and the closer the area raised was to the city, the greater the political activity as a senior. When entered as a block by themselves these two variables explain roughly 11 percent of the variation in political activity after sixty, which is quite good. However, the regression model as a whole is not significantly improved by adding these two variables. Although the addition of the two socialization variables does not disturb the relationship between the original four participation variables, at this point, the basic model is more parsimonious and achieves similar results.

We achieve similar overall results when we add the same two socialization variables to the basic political attention after sixty equation. Our ability to explain variation in our dependent variable is increased by only two percent (30 percent to 32 percent). When entered alone, these two variables are not as strong as they were in the political activity dimension. Here they explain three percent of the variation in political attention after sixty. Of the two socialization variables, political communication [POLCOMM] is stronger; it has a higher beta coefficient and lower significance test value. The area raised variable [PSLIVE] suffers from both a low beta weight

and high significance value. Both are positive, so they act on political attention just as they acted on political activity. The regression model is not significantly improved by adding only these two variables, and in fact, they diminish the importance of political interest before sixty. At this point, the basic model is again more parsimonious and achieves the same results.

The impact of adding the three socialization variables associated with voting to our basic voting equation is dramatic. We find the importance of the variables associated with expressing opinions as a child [EXPRESS] and perception of father's power [POWERDAD] is roughly equal to that of number of politically active friends [BUDSPA] and years in the community [LVYRS]. The significance tests associated with all four of these strong predictors are also very good. The area raised variable [PSLIVE] is not as strong as the other two socialization variables, but it roughly compares in strength to the education and group variables. Alone, these three variables explain roughly 9 percent of the variation in voting activity after sixty. Together with block 1 however, these seven variables allow us to explain 31 percent of the variation in voting activity (*an increase of 11 percent* over the basic model). At this point, these seven variables constitute our best predictive model, and the ability of socialization variables to "hold their own" is clearly evident.

FIGURE 8.2: PREDICTING DIMENSIONS OF POLITICAL ENGAGEMENT
USING PARTICIPATION AND CHILDHOOD SOCIALIZATION VARIABLES

<i>Political Activity</i>			<i>Political Attention</i>			<i>Voting</i>		
	<i>beta</i>	<i>sig T</i>		<i>beta</i>	<i>sig T</i>		<i>beta</i>	<i>sig T</i>
<u>Block 1</u>								
BUDSPA	.35	.0000	CDUTY	.05	.3809	BUDSPA	.26	.0001
GROUP	.26	.0000	GROUP	.16	.0119	EDUC	.10	.1171
INTEFF	.14	.0023	HEALTH	-.11	.0653	GROUP	.15	.0238
PVFOLD	.15	.0089	LVNOW	.14	.0243	LVYRS	.23	.0002
			POLINT1	.07	.3945			
			POLINT2	.38	.0000			
<i>Block 1 R Sq = .41</i>			<i>Block 1 R Sq = .31</i>			<i>Block 1 R Sq = .20</i>		
<u>Block 2</u>								
POLCOMM	.11	.0505	POLCOMM	.10	.1199	EXPRESS	.22	.0004
PSLIVE	.12	.0341	PSLIVE	.05	.4395	POWERDAD	.24	.0002
						PSLIVE	.12	.0535
<i>Block 2 R Sq = .11</i>			<i>Block 2 R Sq = .03</i>			<i>Block 2 R Sq = .09</i>		
<u>Model 2</u>								
<i>R Square = .42</i>			<i>R Square = .32</i>			<i>R Square = .31</i>		
<i>Adjusted R Sq = .41</i>			<i>Adjusted R Sq = .29</i>			<i>Adjusted R Sq = .29</i>		
<i>Durbin Watson = 1.9</i>			<i>Durbin Watson = 2.1</i>			<i>Durbin Watson = 2.0</i>		

Note: Method ENTER, pairwise deletion of missing data.

Model 3: Using Pre-60 Dimension Variables

Because the dimension variables are such potentially strong predictors and may not work well together, we get a clearer sense of their impact when we add them gradually. In this model, we add only the pre-60 dimension variables with the exception of the core pre-60 dimension variable.

When entered alone the two variables political attention [POLATTN1] and voting before sixty [VOTE1] explain 14 percent

of the variation in political activity after sixty, which is quite high. However, our overall ability to explain variation in political activity after sixty is only slightly enhanced (an increase of 3 percent from the basic model) by the addition of these two variables. Their small beta coefficients and high significance values in relation to the other variables in this model suggest they are both *surprisingly poor predictors* of political activity after 60. The best model remains the one containing only participation variables.

We find similar results in the political attention dimension. Political activity [POLACT1] and voting [VOTE1] before sixty do well on their own -- explaining 16 percent of the variation in political attention after sixty -- but are poor predictors in comparison to other variables in the basic model. Model three actually *decreases* our predictive ability by 7 percent! To coordinate Model one participation variables with this approach, and because political interest before sixty [POLINT1] was a poor predictor when combined with political interest after sixty [POLINT2], this model contains only POLINT1. This change increases the importance of POLINT1 but not dramatically. *The decrease in our predictive ability is explained by the absence of POLINT2 in this model.*

We add only political activity before sixty [POLACT1] to our voting equation in this model. Surprisingly, by itself this variable can explain 10 percent of the variation in voting

activity after sixty. Also, unlike the previous two dimensions discussed in this model in which the pre-60 dimension variables were (relatively speaking) poor predictors, POLACT1 is surprisingly strong. It compares in strength to the politically active friends variable, and is not quite as strong as EXPRESS. While this model increases our predictive ability only slightly, it does seem to improve upon our second model.

FIGURE 8.3: PREDICTING DIMENSIONS OF POLITICAL ENGAGEMENT USING PARTICIPATION, CHILDHOOD AND PRE-60 VARIABLES

Political Activity			Political Attention			Voting		
	beta	sig T		beta	sig T		beta	sig T
<u>Block 1</u>								
BUDSPA	.33	.0000	CDUTY	.08	.2640	BUDSPA	.19	.0070
GROUP	.23	.0002	GROUP	.16	.0188	EDUC	.09	.1477
INTEFF	.14	.0235	HEALTH	-.11	.0842	GROUP	.11	.1036
PVFOLD	.15	.0085	LVNOW	.12	.0599	LVYRS	.23	.0002
			POLINT1	.20	.0260			
			POLINT2					
Block 1 R Sq = .41			Block 1 R Sq = .31			Block 1 R Sq = .20		
<u>Block 2</u>								
POLCOMM	.09	.1391	POLCOMM	.04	.5405	EXPRESS	.21	.0006
PSLIVE	.10	.1053	PSLIVE	.03	.6602	POWERDAD	.26	.0000
						PSLIVE	.08	.1868
Block 2 R Sq = .11			Block 2 R Sq = .03			Block 2 R Sq = .09		
<u>Block 3</u>								
POLATTN1	.07	.2855	POLACT1	.12	.1459	POLACT1	.19	.0095
VOTE1	.06	.3850	VOTE1	.04	.6289			
Block 3 R Sq = .14			Block 3 R Sq = .16			Block 3 R Sq = .10		
<u>Model 3</u>								
R Square = .43			R Square = .23			R Square = .34		
Adjusted R Sq = .41			Adjusted R Sq = .20			Adjusted R Sq = .31		
Durbin Watson = 1.91			Durbin Watson = 2.2			Durbin Watson = 2.0		

Note: Method ENTER, pairwise deletion of missing data.

Model 4: Using Post-60 Dimension Variables

It is at this point that we test our best predictive models. The addition of post-60 dimension variables improves our predictive ability in every dimension without causing significant problems for the other variables in the equation (such as those which occur in Model 5).

In the political activity dimension, the addition of political attention [POLATTN2] and voting [VOTE2] after sixty increases our predictive ability by a substantial 10 percent over the basic model. Both dimension variables are strong predictors whose presence is most keenly felt by the group and socialization variables. Alone these two variables can explain an amazing 25 percent of the variation in political activity after sixty. This model can be stated as follows:

Best Predictive Model for Political Activity After Sixty:

POLACT2= BUDSPA + GROUP + INTEFF + PVFOLD + POLCOMM+ PSLIVE+ POLATTN2+ VOTE2

The addition of political activity [POLACT2] and voting [VOTE2] after sixty to the attention dimension is not as dramatically successful but still quite good. Both are good predictors, as evidenced by the fact that these two variables alone can explain 27 percent of the variation in political attention after sixty. The overall model fit (.35) is increased by five percent above that in our original model

(.30). This model is chosen as the best model because it does explain more of the variation in our dependent variable and it seems to give a better sense of the relative importance of the political interest after sixty variable [POLINT2]. While still the best predictor, its importance seemed overstated in Figure 8.1. This model also points out the relative unimportance of civic duty, the area raised, and political communication. Thus, the best model for this dimension is as follows:

Best Predictive Model for Political Attention After Sixty:

POLATTN2= CDUTY+GROUP+ HEALTH+ LVNOW+ POLINT2+ POLCOMM+ PSLIVE+ POLACT2+ VOTE2

The addition of political activity after sixty [POLACT2] to the voting dimension in Model 4 is more successful than the addition of political activity before sixty [POLACT1] in Model 3. POLACT2 is a stronger predictor. Alone it explains 17 percent of the variation in voting activity after sixty, while POLACT1 alone explains 10 percent. The overall model fit (.35) increases our predictive ability by 15 percent over our original model (.20). This model points out the relative unimportance of education, group, and the area in which an individual is raised. Thus, the best model for the voting dimension is as follows:

Best Predictive Model for Voting After Sixty:

VOTE2= BUDSPA+ EDUC+ GROUP+ LVYRS+ EXPRESS+ POWERDAD+ PSLIVE+ POLACT2

FIGURE 8.4: PREDICTING DIMENSIONS OF POLITICAL ENGAGEMENT
USING PARTICIPATION, CHILDHOOD AND POST-60 VARIABLES

Political Activity			Political Attention			Voting		
	beta	sig T		beta	sig T		beta	sig T
<u>Block 1</u>								
BUDSPA	.31	.0000	CDUTY	.06	.7974	BUDSPA	.16	.0231
GROUP	.17	.0023	GROUP	.10	.1277	EDUC	.08	.1922
INTEFF	.15	.0065	HEALTH	-.11	.0743	GROUP	.09	.1917
PVFOLD	.13	.0161	LVNOW	.11	.0570	LVYRS	.21	.0005
			POLINT1					
			POLINT2	.28	.0001			
Block 1 R Sq = .41			Block 1 R Sq = .31			Block 1 R Sq = .20		
<u>Block 2</u>								
POLCOMM	.07	.1753	POLCOMM	.08	.2190	EXPRESS	.20	.0008
PSLIVE	.08	.1551	PSLIVE	.04	.5573	POWERDAD	.24	.0001
						PSLIVE	.08	.1857
Block 2 R Sq = .11			Block 2 R Sq = .03			Block 2 R Sq = .09		
<u>Block 3</u>								
POLATTN1			POLACT1			POLACT1		
VOTE1			VOTE1					
Block 3 R Sq = .14			Block 3 R Sq = .16			Block 3 R Sq = .10		
<u>Block 4</u>								
POLATTN2	.21	.0004	POLACT2	.14	.0556	POLACT2	.25	.0010
VOTE2	.14	.0179	VOTE2	.17	.0192			
Block 4 R Sq = .25			Block 4 R Sq = .27			Block 4 R Sq = .17		
<u>Model 4</u>								
R Square = .50			R Square = .35			R Square = .35		
Adjusted R Sq = .48			Adjusted R Sq = .32			Adjusted R Sq = .33		
Durbin Watson = 1.8			Durbin Watson = 2.1			Durbin Watson = 2.0		

Note: Method ENTER, pairwise deletion of missing data.

Model 5: Adding the Core Pre-60 Dimension Variables

In this model, all variables identified as potentially important were included. Beta coefficients and the sudden emergence of many negative signs indicate that the variables are highly confounded by one another. A correlation matrix (Pearson's R) reveals that the presence of both before and after dimension variables overloads the model. Figure 8.5 is included for one reason: to show just how important the core dimension variables (political activity, political attention and voting activity before sixty) are in predicting future activity in that same dimension. In comparison to the beta weights we saw in the previous models, no beta coefficient was greater than .38. The beta coefficients associated with core variables POLACT1, POLATTN1, and VOTE1 are .75, .67, and .61 respectively. Alone, these core dimension variables (POLACT1, POLATTN1, VOTE1) explain .70, .49, and .43 of the variation in their respective post-60 dimension variables. While regression equations cannot cope with the problems associated with combining all these variables into one equation, the evidence presented in Figure 8.5 suggests the need for further research along these lines.

FIGURE 8.5: PREDICTING DIMENSIONS OF POLITICAL ENGAGEMENT
USING ALL VARIABLES

Political Activity			Political Attention			Voting		
	beta	sig T		beta	sig T		beta	sig T
<u>Block 1</u>								
BUDSPA	.11	.0054	CDUTY	-.04	.3613	BUDSPA	.05	.3570
GROUP	.10	.0070	GROUP	-.01	.8671	EDUC	-.009	.8488
INTEFF	.06	.1278	HEALTH	-.08	.0225	GROUP	.001	.9806
PVFOLD	.20	.9556	LVNOW	.03	.3972	LVYRS	.15	.0022
			POLINT1	-.003	.9441			
			POLINT2	.13	.0307			
Block 1 R Sq = .41			Block 1 R Sq = .31			Block 1 R Sq = .20		
<u>Block 2</u>								
POLCOMM	.04	.2872	POLCOMM	.04	.7441	EXPRESS	.06	.2088
PSLIVE	.02	.6392	PSLIVE	-.09	.0282	POWERDAD	.15	.0043
						PSLIVE	.03	.5351
Block 2 R Sq = .11			Block 2 R Sq = .03			Block 2 R Sq = .09		
<u>Block 3</u>								
POLATTN1	-.15	.0073	POLACT1	-.07	.4173	POLACT1	-.39	.0001
VOTE1	-.23	.0000	VOTE1	-.31	.0000			
Block 3 R Sq = .14			Block 3 R Sq = .16			Block 3 R Sq = .10		
<u>Block 4</u>								
POLATTN2	.19	.0006	POLACT2	.19	.0351	POLACT2	.50	.0000
VOTE2	.20	.0001	VOTE2	.46	.0000			
Block 4 R Sq = .25			Block 4 R Sq = .27			Block 4 R Sq = .17		
<u>Block 5</u>								
POLACT1	.75	.0000	POLATTN1	.67	.0000	VOTE1	.61	.0000
Block 5 R Sq = .70			Block 5 R Sq = .49			Block 5 R Sq = .43		
<u>Model 5</u>								
R Square = .80			R Square = .74			R Square = .59		
Adjusted R Sq = .79			Adjusted R Sq = .72			Adjusted R Sq = .57		
Durbin Watson = 1.9			Durbin Watson = 2.1			Durbin Watson = 2.1		

Note: Method ENTER, pairwise deletion of missing data.

In Sum

In response to our fourth research question (which of the variables we are studying are the most important in distinguishing between the most engaged and the least?), we can say the following:

(1) Based on Figure 8.5, **the core dimension variable is the best predictor for its associated dimension.** Knowing how active the person was before sixty, in that dimension, greatly enhances one's ability to predict that individual's activity in that same dimension after sixty.

(2) Based on Figure 8.4, **beyond the core dimension variables, the top five predictors by dimension** (rank ordered) are as follows:

(a) **for political activity after sixty** -- number of politically active friends, political attention after sixty, group involvement, internal efficacy, and voting after sixty.

(b) **for political attention after sixty** -- political interest after sixty, voting after sixty, political activity after sixty, health, and the area in which an individual currently lives.

(c) **for voting activity after sixty** -- political activity after sixty, perception of father's power, years in the community, expressing opinions as a child, and the number of politically active friends.

Conclusion

The tremendous variation we find in the important predictors supports our theory that these are separate and distinct dimensions of political engagement. As such, they need to be kept separate and not lumped together into large composite variables. Specifically, the findings suggest that to include voting variables in a larger activity scale may cause a serious misreading of the data. The internal efficacy variable, for example, correlates only with political activity beyond voting, not to voting. The importance of the variables associated with group involvement and politically active friends [GROUP and BUDSPA] is also much more evident for activity beyond voting. Years in the community, however, is important only to the voting dimension. *Thus, the findings in this study suggest the deletion of voting variables from political activity scales may be warranted in some cases -- depending upon the results of factor and regression analysis.*

The findings associated with the political attention dimension are new and noteworthy. Use of political participation variables, particularly our dimension variables, but also the more usual participation variables such as health, can explain much of the variation in this dimension. The convergence of all three dimensions of political engagement is most apparent in the attention dimension. Higher levels of activity (after sixty) in the other dimensions act together to increase

attention after sixty. Not surprisingly, one of the best predictors is political interest. However, it is surprising to see how little political activity, voting, and interest before sixty predict attention after sixty. The combination of age, health and other political activities after sixty works together to greatly increase political attention after sixty.

The importance of this dimension in predicting the other dimensions is also noteworthy for students of political participation who tend to ignore this dimension, or simply equate it with political interest. While political interest is not an important distinguishing characteristic for either voting behavior or activity beyond voting, political attention after sixty is one of the top five predictors for political activity after sixty.

Returning to the question of whether or not socialization variables can hold their own against the more usual participation variables, we need to distinguish between the childhood socialization variables and the adult socialization variables which we have referred to as dimension variables. The childhood socialization variables, for the most part, correlate poorly with our dimensions of political engagement and are poor predictors in a regression equation, with a few notable exceptions. The variables representing expressing opinions as a child [EXPRESS] and perception of father's power [POWERDAD] are surprisingly and dramatically successful in the voting

dimension. However, the strength of the [POWERDAD] variable can be explained by the fact that the few who don't vote had fathers low in power while the remaining 86 percent who vote more frequently tend to view their fathers as more powerful. These findings suggest the need to replicate this study on other senior populations to see if they are simply sample specific due to the skewed nature of the sample on the voting dimension.

The adult socialization variables, or political engagement dimension variables, are overwhelmingly successful additions to all models -- although including both before and after sixty dimension variables at the same time can be problematic because of the problems associated with multicollinearity. *These variables highlight the importance of factoring continuity into a predictive model along with present levels of related dimensions of political engagement, but also indicate that such models must be constructed carefully with these high correlation considerations in mind.*

This concludes the data section of the dissertation. In our final chapter, we will attempt to summarize all of our findings and draw conclusions from them.

CHAPTER 9: SUMMARY, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In this chapter we attempt to tie together the information presented thus far and draw some conclusions from it in terms of the research questions asked and hypotheses presented. We began this dissertation by addressing in general terms what the study was about. We highlighted its focus on a homogeneous group of seniors who nevertheless varied in their levels of political engagement. Concerning their levels of engagement, we asked and answered the following four questions:

(1) *Can we characterize the political engagement of seniors as one of change or continuity over the life course?*

(2) *If we see change, is it in the direction of more or less involvement?*

(3) *How do the childhood socialization experiences of highly politically engaged seniors compare with the childhood socialization experiences of less politically engaged seniors?*

(4) *Which of the characteristics we are studying are the most important in distinguishing between the most engaged and the least?*

This study is unique in several ways. Although it is a participation study, it looks beyond the usual suspects, such as efficacy, civic duty and political interest, to variables

drawn from research on political socialization, prosocial behavior, and political communication. This dual focus on both socialization variables from an individual's past and simultaneous attention to participation variables in an individual's present is also unique. And finally, our distinction between three separate dimensions of participation -- activity beyond voting, attention, and voting -- is unusual. Because we stretch the meaning of participation to include the political attention dimension, we prefer to use the term *political engagement*.

While Chapter Two argues that many socialization variables offer potentially important clues which may help to explain why some seniors participate while others do not, this study fits firmly within the subfield of political participation. As such, we are also concerned with the more well-documented participation variables currently recognized in the discipline.

The participation variables discussed in Chapter Three are useful for two reasons. First, they help us to differentiate our seniors. In the political activity dimension, for example, just four key participation variables (politically active friends, group involvement, internal efficacy, and ideology folded) explain 40 percent of the variation in our dependent variable. Second, these variables offer a standard against which to compare our less tested and more unusual socialization variables. As we saw in the last chapter, for the most part,

childhood socialization variables fare poorly, with the exception of the area raised [PSLIVE], expressing opinions [EXPRESS] and father's power [POWERDAD], but the adult dimension variables did very well, especially those measuring activity after sixty.

Our findings in this study are many and varied. While some lend additional support to conventional wisdom, many challenge assumptions of core socialization and participation research. For example, non-findings regarding the importance of childhood socialization variables to future political behavior suggest that for people who have lived the longest, childhood variables are not as strong as has been assumed. The significance of these non-findings is all the more compelling because these seniors were raised in a more family centered era. At best, childhood socialization variables (associated with the parent-child relationship) seem to simply give individuals a "push" in the "right" direction.

On the other hand, findings regarding the importance of continuity and also our three dimensional approach to political engagement challenge most models of political participation. Specifically, most models do not include variables designed to measure continuity. Most models also present a unidimensional view of participation by combining both voting and activity beyond voting into a single scale. Attention variables are

largely ignored. The findings in this study suggest that these two approaches may need to be reevaluated.

Based on the comparison between our senior sample and the 1992 ANES senior sample, we cannot hope to generalize the findings of this study to a larger, more heterogeneous, group of seniors. There are too many differences; our sample is better educated, better paid, more liberal and more politically active. While this sample lacks the wide variation in education and income found in a national sample, its homogenous quality is, in some respects, an asset to this study. We are able to concentrate our energies on characteristics that are not so tied to education and income. We are focusing on America's "middle class" seniors [or what Morris and Bass would call America's "new class" of seniors (1991, 95)], who, for the most part, have the skills they need to participate, *if they want to*. A logical answer for why some do and some don't might be simply the degree of political interest. The higher the interest, the greater the likelihood that these natural candidates for political involvement will indeed participate. However, findings in Chapter Seven suggest that interest does not distinguish the most active from the least except in the attention dimension -- a dimension usually ignored by participation studies! Our findings in Chapters Five through Eight help us to distinguish between these seniors using other types of variables.

Beyond the demographics of education and income, we are fortunate to have a wide distribution in levels of political activity, party identification, efficacy, and religion. The inclusion of so many Panthers in our study skews our distribution in many cases toward one end of the scale, but this disadvantage is either diminished by folding the scale, or outweighed by the great scientific interest their presence lends to this research.

Study Findings and Their Implications

Continuity versus Change

Returning to the literature review and theoretical arguments presented in Chapter Two, we hypothesized that a good predictor of political engagement after sixty would be political engagement before sixty. The persistence, generational, activity and continuity models convincingly argued continuity more accurately described the behavior of most adults. Those who had always been active would continue to be active, those politically active would "persist" in that type of behavior, those not politically engaged would not become that way late in life. Although a few might "deviate" from this "norm," we should not expect people to change their levels of political activity once they retired. For those who did show change, available models did little to help us

determine which direction it would take. While the lifelong openness and life cycle theories encouraged us to expect increased political activity, disengagement and exchange theories argued the opposite would be true for most.

We find in fact, that regardless of activity level, continuity does reign supreme, but there is more change than expected -- particularly in the political activity dimension, no doubt because of the energy required. Those who change in the political activity dimension tend to decrease community problem solving, meeting attendance, and election work. Both contacting public officials and contributing money have almost as many seniors increasing as decreasing those activities. This may help to explain the prominence of the AARP. As the political activity of individuals decreases, group representation may become all the more important.

While continuity also dominates the political attention dimension, for those who change the tendency is clearly in the direction of *increased* activity for every aspect of this dimension. This holds true for all subsamples. Percentages for increased listening to the radio and watching television political shows are particularly high.

Continuity is particularly evident in the voting dimension, but for those who change the tendency is in the direction of *increased* activity (except for Panthers, who will be discussed shortly). As we mentioned earlier, any findings

associated with this dimension are extremely tentative due to the skewed nature of the sample. There is little variation across our voting categories, and most individuals fall at only one end of the scale -- frequently or always voting.

The importance of continuity has been largely ignored in participation literature. These findings suggest the need to incorporate the continuity factor into our predictive models especially with regard to voting behavior.

For those who change, our findings tend to support Steckenrider and Cutler's belief that "overall, many of the roles assumed in old age suggest *increased* political interest and participation" (Sigel, 1989, 80). However, we can expect increased activity as long as it is *passive, or requires little physical energy* -- voting, letter writing, check writing, reading, listening, or watching television. This decrease of the most active forms of participation suggests only a limited degree of *disengagement*, or withdrawal, from politics. However, while the literature suggests that disengagement is limited to a minority of seniors, these data suggest that this more limited sense of disengagement is *pervasive*. While leaders may not have much of a pool of potential workers to galvanize, they can certainly count on seniors to stay or become increasingly attentive and to keep voting.

Exchange theory suggested that variables concerning a senior's power resources, particularly the power derived from

an individual's association with others in a group, such as the Gray Panthers, might be particularly important in this study. It also suggested that for most seniors, we could expect less activity as their power resources declined. Data in this study suggests that the most significant "power resources" to these seniors are internal efficacy and group involvement. Income is not an important differentiating variable for these seniors (perhaps because retirement income does not necessarily reflect income levels or status achieved during middle age). Education is a key ingredient to high levels of internal efficacy, and also membership in groups, at least as far as Panthers are concerned. Thus, educating seniors is a first step in building their levels of internal efficacy. Education increases understanding and can teach seniors how, when, where, why and what they need to do. Groups such as the AARP and Panthers are particularly suited to this function. Seniors who are not group members lose out not only on the motivation that other members provide but also on the educational benefits of belonging. Thus, it is no wonder that group membership is such an important variable particularly in the activity dimension.

Childhood Socialization Variables

In Chapter Two we referenced Sigel's belief that "while we do have much information on how adults at a given moment act or react -- their vote, policy preferences, and so on -- we lack

systematic knowledge of whether such behavior is a *carryover from values learned during childhood or whether it has arisen in response to changed social or personal circumstances not anticipated in childhood*" (1989, x, emphasis added). This study included variables designed to test the persistence of several aspects of childhood socialization.

Of the four models we reviewed, we were most persuaded by the life cycle model. The persistence theory seemed to place too much importance on childhood and didn't allow for the growth and/or change in attitudes as an adult. The lifelong openness model didn't seem to place *enough* importance on the impact of childhood socialization. The generational model built upon the persistence model, but also took larger societal forces into account. However, it didn't account for change after one passed beyond the "impressionable years" as well as life cycle theory did. Because life cycle theorists suggested that change usually occurred in response to major life changes and/or period influences, the theory was more appealing because it allowed for growth/change after a person reached adulthood but stipulated that the change needed a strong catalyst. The great staying power of values, attitudes, and behaviors acquired early was acknowledged, but the impact of adult experiences (catalysts) such as marriage and retirement was given greater credit for the ability to mitigate or reverse the results of childhood socialization.

Our findings concerning childhood socialization variables do little to change this conclusion. The lack of correlation between most of our socialization variables and our dimensions of political engagement seems to effectively rule out the persistence model, except for its emphasis on continuity. Our findings supporting the importance of a pluralistic home environment, and the more tentative findings supporting the importance of politically engaged role modeling (particularly by the mother) suggest the childhood environment should not be ignored. The data in this study do nothing to support or refute the dominant role of the family in childhood socialization; instead, they suggest that other influences over the course of a lifetime can clearly have important mitigating results. One only has to look at the high number of politically active seniors who emerged from nonpluralistic or nonauthoritative homes to see that this is the case. In this sense we agree with Jennings and Niemi's conclusion that "life cycle effects, the role of other socializing agents and attitude instabilities help account for the very noticeable departures from the model positing high transmission" (1981, 347).

Especially noteworthy were the non-findings associated with the Chaffee and Baumrind typologies. Highly engaged seniors in any dimension do not tend to come from pluralistic homes as the Chaffee model suggests; they tend to come with almost equal frequency from both consensual and laissez-faire

homes. In a similar vein, highly engaged seniors in any dimension do not tend to come from authoritative homes as the Baumrind model suggests; they tend to come with almost equal frequency from both authoritarian and permissive homes.

These non-findings are extremely encouraging. Had there been significant correlations evident, the future for children in homes that are not pluralistic or authoritative would be more predictable. It is encouraging to think that our most politically active seniors emerged from all types of family backgrounds. While some variables (pluralistic homes, politically active role modeling) do push children in the direction of greater political activity as an adult, absence of that variable does not limit the child's potential to engage in political activity in the future. We want the democratic process to be as open as possible to every citizen. The fewer the obstacles between individuals and activism the better.

However, in terms of advice to parents on how to encourage future political engagement, the evidence suggests that political activity, particularly by the mother, and a pluralistic communication environment, and an urban/suburban residence do push children in that direction to a greater extent than nonactive, nonpluralistic, rural/small town homes. The benefit of being raised in a home which encouraged discussion and expression of ideas to senior political engagement was remarkably consistent across all three dimensions, as was the

benefit of being raised in or near a city. The future value of early communication concerning *politics* was more evident in the activity and attention dimensions. The voting dimension was more highly correlated with variables which measured expressing opinions and not "giving in" on arguments.

Findings in this area also offer support for research conducted by Hess and Torney (1965). They found that children who saw their fathers as powerful ("can make anyone do what he wants") tended to be more informed and interested in political matters as a young adult (1965, 193). While the psychological connection between this perception and future action is not explained by Hess and Torney, we can speculate that these forceful fathers encouraged their children to perform their "civic duty" when they grew up. That civic duty may have been defined as voting, and/or may have included activities beyond voting. These data suggest that this perception may have much more far reaching consequences than simply young adulthood, spanning instead, the entire life course.

While the extent of the non-findings associated with our childhood socialization variables may be encouraging from the standpoint of democratic theory, they are disappointing from a more pragmatic perspective. The considerable effort expended to justify, collect and analyze this data merits speculation concerning why so few were good predictors. Several possible reasons suggest themselves.

First, the variables that worked the best came from political socialization literature (variables associated with political communication within families, and power relationships). These variables had already been tested on other, larger samples and were found to be significant in terms of political activity and interest. The variables that were less successful came from the prosocial behavior literature. Their relationship to future political activity was purely *theoretical*. Their inclusion in this study represents a *first* attempt to tie these two strands of literature together. Therefore, while the failure of these variables to predict dimensions of political engagement is disappointing, it is not totally unexpected.

Secondly, our variables represent the operationalization of complicated concepts. The variables which worked better may simply indicate more accurate measurement techniques of less sensitive issues, as opposed to a poor theory. It seems logical to assume that survey respondents will be more inclined to answer questions concerning less sensitive issues such as communication patterns than they will be to answer more sensitive issues such as the emotional environment in their childhood home. The particularly negative findings associated with the Panthers -- parents who are cold, nonsupportive, independent and demanding -- may simply reflect their greater openness about the true nature of their relationships with

their parents. Their greater openness may be the result of the conversation they had with the author before they completed the survey (which increased their level of trust in the purpose of the survey), or the fact that most are extremely liberal [in the sense that liberal people tend to be more trusting than conservative people (Baradat, 1984, 35)]. These types of questions might be better studied through in-depth interviews than through surveys (either because trust must be coaxed, not assumed, or because the nuances of childhood socialization are not easily captured through closed-ended questions). On the other hand, the anonymity of surveys can be an advantage in this regard.

And finally, the limitations of the sample itself may help to explain these non-findings. Many failed to fill out the socialization section entirely or completely (see Chapter Four for details). In addition, these variables may require a more heterogeneous population (including African-Americans, for example) if their impact is to be adequately addressed. Thus, these findings bear further investigation on a larger, more "normal," population of seniors.

Political Engagement Variables

The literature review in Chapter Three led us to include several theoretically important predictors in our study. Many of these variables behaved differently than expected. One

reason for this difference was undoubtedly our decision to distinguish between dimensions of political engagement. Participation studies which combine dimensions into one scale may result in findings that are specifically related to only one dimension but are presented as being related to participation as a whole. As we isolated findings in terms of the activity, attention and voting dimensions we found considerable differences emerged. For example, characteristics that helped to explain voting activity after sixty, such as years in the community and education, had little or no correlation to political activity or political attention after sixty. As a general comment, dimension variables were good predictors of their own and other dimensions. The political attention dimension variable was particularly useful in predicting political activity after sixty. The findings in this study suggest that future research in political participation might benefit from distinguishing between at least the two separate dimensions of voting and activity beyond voting, and from paying greater attention to various measures of the attention dimension, as well.

Another reason these variables may have acted differently than expected lies in the nature of the sample. Beyond the fact that the sample is made up of seniors *exclusively*, as we mentioned earlier, its homogeneity diminishes the importance of demographics such as education and income, and undoubtedly

other variables, as well. Although we were fortunate to have a wide distribution in levels of political activity, it is a sample much more politically active than the norm. It is also more liberal and more highly educated than the norm. The inclusion of so many Panthers in our study skews our distribution in many cases toward one end of the scale. These limitations help to explain many of our non-findings.

The Political Activity Dimension

According to evidence presented in Chapter Seven, among seniors, our most politically active are characterized by: higher education, more politically active friends, high group commitment, high civic duty and internal efficacy, strong ideology (in either direction), and high levels of political interest before and after sixty. The least active do not necessarily have little education, a low sense of civic duty, or less political interest. According to our best predictive model in Chapter Eight, beyond the core dimension variable, the top five predictors for political activity after sixty are politically active friends, political attention after sixty, group involvement, internal efficacy and voting activity after sixty.

Findings regarding age, education, free time, group involvement, years in the community, political interest, civic duty, internal efficacy, ideology and trust generally support

hypotheses drawn from the literature. The most significant non-findings are those associated with the following variables (all poorly correlated with the post-60 political activity dimension): health, spouse activity, marriage, senior center attendance, partisanship (folded), and external efficacy. The correlation of internal efficacy but not external efficacy is hard to explain and needs to be examined further. It may be related only to senior responses in this particular sample.

The Political Attention Dimension

Our data suggest that *among seniors*, the most politically attentive seniors are characterized by: at least some college education, high group commitment, a current suburban/urban residence, a high sense of civic duty, and high levels of political interest before and after sixty. Of those in poor/fair health, most are moderately to highly attentive. The least attentive are not necessarily characterized by less education or fewer politically active friends. The top five predictors for political attention after sixty (again excluding its core dimension variable) are political interest after sixty, voting activity after sixty, and political activity after sixty, health, and current residence location.

Findings concerning education, health, sex, current residence, civic duty, group involvement are much as expected. The most significant non-findings are those associated with the

following variables: free time, politically active friends, spouse activity, marriage, years in the community, senior center attendance, ideology and partisanship (folded). Of these, the lack of correlation between free time and political attention is perhaps the most surprising. This may be due to the question itself. It is likely that individuals may have difficulty deciding how much of their time is "free."

The Voting Dimension

Our data suggest that *among seniors*, the most frequent voters are characterized by the following participation variables: higher levels of education and group commitment, more politically active friends, more years in the community, a higher sense of civic duty, and high levels of political interest before and after sixty. However, less frequent voters are not necessarily lower in their sense of civic duty, or level of political interest before or after sixty. The top five predictors for voting activity after sixty (excluding its core dimension variable) are political activity after sixty, perception of father's power, years in the community, being encouraged to express opinions as a child, and politically active friends.

These findings support literature concerning the variables education, sex, health, group involvement, years in the community, civic duty and political interest. The most

significant non-findings are those associated with the following variables: free time, spouse activity, marriage, senior center attendance, current residence location, ideology and partisanship (folded), and external and internal efficacy. Of these, the most surprising "non-finding" is the lack of correlation between either efficacy variable and voting. This non-finding may suggest that efficacy is not necessary to voting because voting is such a nonthreatening activity. It also supports our view that voting variables should not be included in larger political activity scales. However, our lack of nonvoters make this non-finding tentative at best.

Distinguishing Between Samples

We find the two county samples surprisingly similar across dimensions of political engagement despite their demographic differences. This similarity may be partially explained by the high percentage of government workers in both counties. Future studies which attempt a similar rural-suburban comparison might look for counties without this important similarity. However, as the trend seems to be one of increasing mobility for individuals of all ages, counties containing truly distinct groups of seniors may be more the exception than the rule.

The most significant difference between the two county samples is the higher level of external efficacy enjoyed by Arlington seniors. While sampling from seniors attending AARP

and United Seniors meetings helps to explain this finding as it compares to the St Mary's County sample, it does nothing to explain why the level is higher than Panthers!

The Gray Panthers

Any findings concerning the Panthers are significant because we know so little about them. While Panthers are often mentioned in articles, they are usually discussed in terms of their activity as an interest group; data concerning the members themselves is virtually nonexistent. The Panthers offer a rich, untapped source of future research possibilities.

The most significant findings and non-findings associated with the Panthers are summarized in Chapters Six and Seven. It bears repeating that findings concerning religion, external efficacy and parent-child relationships are much different than expected and merit further investigation. These findings suggest the following questions:

(1) How unique are these Panthers? Do other groups of Panthers exhibit the same characteristics?

(2) What is the relationship between the Unitarian Church and the political activism of not only its seniors but all adult members?

Concluding Comments

This study focused on a group of people of increasing interest as the huge Baby-Boom generation ages. Was it worth it? Did we learn anything? Based on the evidence presented throughout the past five chapters, the answer to both questions is an unqualified yes. Scholarly attention to the political behavior of seniors is long overdue and offers a rich source of data on life span political involvement. This study represents the tip of a very large iceberg. Its findings are encouraging considering the size and limitations of the sample. The use of retrospective data met with limited success in the section devoted to childhood socialization but enjoyed greater success on less sensitive subjects. (This problem may be alleviated if greater trust is established between the researcher and respondent.)

While some might interpret the non-findings as cause for ignoring childhood socialization variables in future research on seniors, we believe the parent-child relationship should be examined further based on *findings*. While sample limitations make findings tentative, they are, in many cases, quite dramatic and merit further investigation. Two of three important socialization variables ended up in the list of "top five" best predictors for voting activity after sixty. The inclusion of all three socialization variables in the predictive model for voting dramatically increased its explanatory power. The two

socialization variables included in the activity and attention dimension models were also useful in explaining variation in the dependent variable.

Variables derived from prosocial behavior literature merit reexamination because although their correlational data were poor, their theoretical underpinnings seem sound. Non-findings may simply reflect problems discussed earlier (i.e. poor operationalization, sample population, missing observations). Other potentially important childhood socialization variables may include: larger family dynamics (such as the influence of siblings and grandparents), schools, peers, and political figures (such as Roosevelt).

Those concerned about the distance between the senior's present and recollections about their childhood might be more comfortable with research focusing on mitigating influences that occurred during adulthood -- such as the effects of college, marriage, or major societal events (such as war or the Depression). This approach would help us to determine which of the life span models (generational, life cycle, or lifelong openness) is the most accurate reflection of adult socialization. The possibilities are limitless.

The alliance between political socialization and political participation suggested by this study offers both subfields the chance for new direction and could prove to be a union that invigorates both.

APPENDIX A

FINAL VERSION OF SURVEY

Thank you for taking part in my study. This survey is confidential. Your willingness to answer any question is completely voluntary. If you are not sure about your answer to a particular question, please leave it blank. There are questions on both sides of each page.

A1. 0. ____ Male 1. ____ Female

A2. County and State of Residence _____

A3. How would you describe the area where you live now?

- 0. rural (farm or farming community)
- 1. a small town or city (under 50,000)
- 2. a medium sized city (50,000-250,000)
- 3. a large city (over 250,000)
- 4. a suburb near a large city

A4. How many years have you lived in your community? _____

A5. Where do you currently live?

- 0. in a private residence (house, apartment)
- 1. in a retirement community, since (year) _____
- 2. in a nursing home, since (year) _____
- 3. other _____

A6. How would you describe your race?

- 0. White, caucasian
- 1. Black, African-American
- 2. Hispanic
- 3. _____

A7. Is English your native language? 0. no 1. yes

A8. Birth year _____

A9. Are you currently employed? 0. no 1. yes

A10. deleted [Briefly describe the general nature of your employment now, or if retired, in the past.]

A11. deleted [If employed by the federal or state government (you or your spouse), do you think you would have been more involved in local or national politics if there had not been laws limiting your political activity?]

Now I'd like to ask you about how often you engaged in various types of political activities before and after age 60.

BEFORE AGE 60

B1. If we rate activities on a scale from 1 to 5 where 1 = NEVER, 2 = RARELY, 3 = OCCASIONALLY, 4 = FREQUENTLY, 5 = ALWAYS, would you say that you

- | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. watched TV news | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| b. watched TV political shows such as McNeil-Lehrer | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| c. read political news in papers and/or magazines | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| d. listened to political talk radio | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| e. voted in local and/or state elections | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| f. voted in primaries and/or caucuses | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| g. voted in national elections | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| h. attended political meetings or rallies | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| i. worked with others to solve community problems | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| j. personally contacted politicians | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| k. worked in election campaigns | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| l. contributed money to parties, candidates, causes | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| m. demonstrated on behalf of a particular cause | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

SINCE AGE 60

B2. If we rate activities on a scale from 1 to 5 where 1 = NEVER, 2 = RARELY, 3 = OCCASIONALLY, 4 = FREQUENTLY, 5 = ALWAYS, would you say that you

- | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. watch TV news | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| b. watch TV political shows such as McNeil-Lehrer | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| c. read political news in papers and/or magazines | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| d. listen to political talk radio | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| e. vote in local and/or state elections | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| f. vote in primaries and/or caucuses | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| g. vote in national elections | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| h. attended political meetings or rallies | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| i. worked with others to solve community problems | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| j. personally contacted politicians | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| k. worked in election campaigns | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| l. contributed money to parties, candidates, causes | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| m. demonstrated on behalf of a particular cause | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

C1. deleted [If you were politically active before 60, can you explain what or who motivated you to get involved? (space provided)]

C2. deleted [For those of you politically active since 60 (or retirement), can you explain what or who motivates you to stay involved, or motivated you to get involved? (space provided)]

D1. Before age 60, how interested were you in following what was going on in government and public affairs?

1. never interested
2. seldom interested
3. occasionally interested
4. frequently interested
5. always interested

D2. Since age 60, how interested are you in following what is going on in government and public affairs?

1. never interested
2. seldom interested
3. occasionally interested
4. frequently interested
5. always interested

D3. Before age 60, were you a member of any organizations or groups (such as fraternal, service, veterans, political, labor, sports, youth, hobby, nationality, discussion, professional, church-affiliated, etc.)?

0. no 1. yes

D4. If yes (to question D3), did you hold an elected position at any time before age 60?

0. no 1. yes

D5. Since age 60, have you become a member, or continued membership, in any organizations or groups (such as those mentioned in D3)?

0. no 1. yes

D6. If yes (to question D5), have you held an elected position at any time since age 60?

0. no 1. yes

D7. Which (if any) of the following groups are you a member of?

- a. American Association of Retired Persons
- b. United Seniors Association
- c. National Council of Senior Citizens
- d. National Committee to Preserve Social Security and Medicare
- e. Gray Panthers
- f. another group considered politically active _____
- g. none of the above

D8-D11. deleted

[D8. If you circled any of the groups listed in D7 (a-f), would you say that one of the primary reasons you joined was to increase the influence of senior citizens in Washington?

... D8a. What about to increase the influence of senior citizens in your local community?

D9. Do you think ANY of the groups you belong to now increases the influence of senior citizens in Washington?

D10. Do you think you would be more politically active if there weren't groups like AARP looking out for your interests?

D11. Would you say that, based on your present circumstances (residence, health, etc.), actively participating in a political organization is easy to do?

E2-4. If you had to place yourself on a scale from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating strong Democrat and 7 indicating strong Republican, where would you place yourself? If you consider yourself a member of another party, please indicate which one over number 8 on the scale.

Strong Democrat							Strong Republican		Other		none of the above
1	2	3	4	5	6	7			8		9

E5. In general, before age 60, where would you have placed yourself on the following scale?

Extremely Liberal							Extremely Conservative	don't know
1	2	3	4	5	6	7		8

E6. In general, compared to your answer to E5, since age 60, are you

- more liberal than you used to be?
- more conservative than you used to be?
- about the same?

F1-F4. deleted.

[F1. In your social groups (friends, family, clubs) do you

- keep abreast of other's happenings
- get behind on the news

F2. Generally, does new and non-routine interaction, such as going somewhere for the first time,

- stimulate and energize you
- tax your reserves

F3. Do you

- speak easily and at length with strangers
- find little to say to strangers

F4. At a party do you

- interact with many, including strangers
- interact with a few, known to you]

Now I'd like to find out your response to a set of statements.

F5-F19 ask you to CIRCLE A RESPONSE ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree.

F5. Voting is the only way people like me can have any say about how the government runs things.

strongly agree - agree - agree/disagree - disagree - strongly disagree

F6. People like me don't have any say about what the government does.

strongly agree - agree - agree/disagree - disagree - strongly disagree

F7. Often, politics and government seem so complicated a person like me can't understand what's going on.

strongly agree - agree - agree/disagree - disagree - strongly disagree

F8. Public officials care about what people like me think.

strongly agree - agree - agree/disagree - disagree - strongly disagree

F9. Generally, our representatives in Congress lose touch with the people pretty quickly.

strongly agree - agree - agree/disagree - disagree - strongly disagree

F10. Politicians are only interested in people's votes not their opinions.

strongly agree - agree - agree/disagree - disagree - strongly disagree

F11. So many other people vote in the national elections that it doesn't matter much to me whether I vote or not.

strongly agree - agree - agree/disagree - disagree - strongly disagree

F12. If a person doesn't care how an election comes out then that person shouldn't vote in it.

strongly agree - agree - agree/disagree - disagree - strongly disagree

F13. It isn't important to vote when your party doesn't have any chance to win.

strongly agree - agree - agree/disagree - disagree - strongly disagree

F14. A good many local elections aren't important enough to bother with.

strongly agree - agree - agree/disagree - disagree - strongly disagree

F15. Citizens of this country have a duty to vote.

strongly agree - agree - agree/disagree - disagree - strongly disagree

F16. deleted [My generation was raised to believe women should stay out of politics.]

F17. Growing up, politics was frequently discussed in our house.

strongly agree - agree - agree/disagree - disagree - strongly disagree

F18. Politics is really men's business.

strongly agree - agree - agree/disagree - disagree - strongly disagree

F19. deleted [I was raised to believe women should stay out of pols.]

F20. Generally, I have faith and confidence in the following to do what's right for those they represent. (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY.)

- a. Political Parties
- b. The Supreme Court
- c. Congress as a whole
- d. President
- e. State Government
- f. Local Government
- g. My State Senators and Representatives in Congress
- h. None of the Above

G1. How would you describe the area where you were raised?

- 0. rural (farm or farming community)
- 1. a small town or city (under 50,000)
- 2. a medium sized city (50,000-250,000)
- 3. a large city (over 250,000)
- 4. a suburb near a large city

G2. What is your marital status?

- 0. widowed/divorced/separated
- 1. never married
- 2. married, living with spouse

G3. Do you live alone? 0. no 1. yes

G4. Do you have family close enough for you to see them often?

- 0. no 1. yes

G5. Do you have grandchildren? 0. no 1. yes

G6. Your annual retirement income (if married, you and spouse) before taxes?

- 0. under 10000
- 1. 10000-29999
- 2. 30000-49999
- 3. 50000-74999
- 4. over 75000

G7. Which class, if any, do you consider yourself a member of?

- 0. the working class
- 1. the lower middle class
- 2. the middle class
- 3. the upper middle class
- 4. the upper class
- 5. none of the above

- G8. What is your level of education? _____
- G9. How would you describe your health (as compared to others your age)?
0. poor 1. fair 2. good 3. excellent
- G10. deleted [How mobile are you physically?]
- G11. How often do you attend a community social/recreation center?
0. never
1. rarely
2. frequently
3. daily
- G12. deleted [Do you feel in control of your own schedule?]
- G13. Would you say that most of the friends you spend time with now are the same ones you have always had?
0. no 1. yes
- G14. How many of your friends are politically active?
0. none
1. a few
2. a majority
3. all
- G15. Would you describe your spouse as politically active?
0. no
1. yes (how? _____)
9. not applicable
- G16. Aside from the time you are obligated to devote to certain activities (cleaning, cooking, etc.) or people, how much personal time do you have left in a normal day?
0. less than 1 hour
1. 1-2 hours
2. 3-5 hours
3. over 5 hours

In an effort to better understand the relationship between early influences and subsequent political activism, the last section largely concerns your childhood. If you were raised by a person or persons other than a parent, please substitute male or female "guardian" when considering your response.

- H1. Who were you raised by?
0. mother and father
1. mother
2. father
3. other _____

H2. How many adults lived in your household during your childhood?__

H3. How many children were there in your family? _____

H4. Where were you in the birth order?

1. oldest/only child
2. middle
3. youngest

H5. Using the following scale, do you remember your mother as someone who could make anyone do what she wanted them to do?

Yes	Almost no one
Anyone	
1	6
2	
3	
4	
5	

H6. Using the following scale, do you remember your father as someone who could make anyone do what he wanted them to do?

Yes	Almost no one
Anyone	
1	6
2	
3	
4	
5	

H7. If you had to place your mother on a scale from 1 to 7 with 1 indicating strong Democrat and 7 indicating strong Republican, where would you place her? If she considered herself a member of another party, please indicate which one over number 8 on the scale.

Strong Democrat		Independent		Strong Republican		Other		none of the above
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

H8. If you had to place your father on a scale from 1 to 7 with 1 indicating strong Democrat and 7 indicating strong Republican, where would you place him? If he considered himself a member of another party, please indicate which one over number 8 on the scale.

Strong Democrat		Independent		Strong Republican		Other		none of the above
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

H9. Did you volunteer in any capacity (Red Cross, church, etc.) when you were a teenager?

0. no
1. yes

H10. Did your parents (either or both) volunteer in any capacity when you were growing up?

0. no
1. yes

H11. Were either of your parents deeply religious?

0. no
1. yes

H12. Did you attend religious services regularly as a child?

0. no
1. yes

H13. If yes, (to H12), what religious denomination? _____

H14. What, if any, is your religious preference NOW? _____

H15. How important is God in your life?

- 0. not important
- 1. somewhat important
- 2. very important

H16. If you had to place your mother on a scale from 1 to 7, with 1 indicating extremely liberal and 7 extremely conservative, where would you place her?

Extremely Liberal							Extremely Conservative	don't know
1	2	3	4	5	6	7		8

H17. If you had to place your father on a scale from 1 to 7 with 1 indicating extremely liberal and 7 extremely conservative, where would you place him?

Extremely Liberal							Extremely Conservative	don't know
1	2	3	4	5	6	7		8

H18. When you were growing up, did your mother engage in any of the following activities FREQUENTLY/ALWAYS? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

- a. read political news
- b. voted
- c. attended political meetings or rallies
- d. worked with others to solve community problems
- e. personally contacted politicians
- f. worked in election campaigns
- g. contributed money to parties, candidates, causes
- h. demonstrated on behalf of a particular cause
- i. don't know / none of the above

H19. When you were growing up, did your father engage in any of the following activities FREQUENTLY/ALWAYS? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

- a. read political news
- b. voted
- c. attended political meetings or rallies
- d. worked with others to solve community problems
- e. personally contacted politicians
- f. worked in election campaigns
- g. contributed money to parties, candidates, causes
- h. demonstrated on behalf of a particular cause
- i. don't know / none of the above

H20. Listed below are some things that parents often teach their children. For each one, circle how often your parents said it to you using a scale from 1 to 4 where 1 = NEVER, 2 = RARELY, 3 = SOMETIMES, and 4 = OFTEN.

My parents encouraged me...

- | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|
| a. to show anger in group situations | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| b. to challenge parental opinions | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| c. to argue with those older and more experienced | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| d. to keep out of trouble by avoiding conflict | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| e. to give in on arguments, rather than make someone mad | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| f. to get my ideas across, no matter what others said | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| g. to look at both sides of an issue | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| h. to participate in family discussions about politics | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| i. to participate in family decisions | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

My parents...

- | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|
| i. took a side they didn't believe in,
for the sake of argument | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| j. visited people who took the other side in arguments
about politics or religion | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

H21. Below, in column 1, is a list of adjectives. Please place check marks in column 2 to indicate which of these adjectives best describes the overall nature of your relationship with your mother when you were a child/teen. Do the same in column 3 to describe your relationship with your father, and in column 4 to describe the relationship between your parents. CHECK ALL ADJECTIVES THAT APPLY.

Column 1 Adjective	Column 2 Relationship with Mother	Column 3 Relationship with Father	Column 4 Relationship between Parents
Happy	_____	_____	_____
Angry/Irritable	_____	_____	_____
Supportive/Encouraging	_____	_____	_____
Nagging/Stressful	_____	_____	_____
Honest/Open/Trusting	_____	_____	_____
Secretive/Distrustful	_____	_____	_____
Stern/Strict/Controlling	_____	_____	_____
Permissive	_____	_____	_____
Cold/Harsh/Distant	_____	_____	_____
Warm/Loving/Kind	_____	_____	_____
Demanding (high expectations)	_____	_____	_____
Indifferent	_____	_____	_____
Predictable/Consistent	_____	_____	_____
Unpredictable/Inconsistent	_____	_____	_____
Violent/Abusive/Threatening	_____	_____	_____
Independent	_____	_____	_____
Overprotective	_____	_____	_____

- H22. When you did something wrong, what was the **usual** response?
1. explanation of why behavior was inappropriate
 2. nonphysical punishment (sent to room, etc)
 3. combination of 1 and 2
 4. light physical punishment
 5. combination of 1 and 4
 6. harsh physical punishment
 7. combination of 1 and 6
- H23. Would you say that you started taking on adult responsibilities (job, caring for younger siblings, chores, etc.) ...
1. before age 10
 2. between ages of 10-15
 3. between ages of 16-21
 4. after age 21

Note: The survey has been reformatted to better conform to the margins of the dissertation as a whole, but the questions are complete. Questions included in one or both pretests, but deleted for the final survey, are also included.

APPENDIX B

VARIABLE LIST

This list represents a complete guide to variables used in this study. As noted, some variables are scales created by adding variables together. Reliability scores (Kronbach's alpha) are reported. Variables are listed alphabetically under subject headings. Different versions of a particular variable are also included in the list. Questions used to measure a particular variable are indicated but have been condensed. See Appendix A for a complete set of survey questions.

VARIABLE QUESTION(S) USED, OR METHOD FOR CREATING VARIABLE

BAUMRIND TYPOLOGY VARIABLES AND SCALES:

PARSWARM MOPEN + MSAME + MSUPPORT + MWARM
 Kronbach's alpha = .7927

PCONTROL MSTERN + DSTERN + MDEMAND + DDEMAND + MLAXR + DLAXR
 Kronbach's alpha = .6304
 Coded...0. Low control... 6. High control

POLCOMM ARGUE + DISCUSS + EXPRESS + PSCOM1 + VISIT
 Kronbach's alpha = .7165

RESPON B23. Adult responsibility? 1. Pre 10, 2. 10-15, 2. 16-21, 3. GT 21.

CIVIC DUTY VARIABLES AND SCALE: Coded... 0. Strongly Agree, 1. Agree, 2. A/D, 3. Disagree, 4. Strongly Disagree

NOCARE F12. If a person doesn't care, then they shouldn't vote.

NOCARE3 NOCARE collapsed: 0,1=1. Agree, 2=2. Agree/Disagree, 3,4=3. Disagree

NOLOCAL F14. Many local elections aren't important.

NOLOCAL3 NOLOCAL collapsed: 0,1=1. Agree, 2=2. Agree/Disagree, 3,4=3. Disagree

NOMATTER F11. So many other people vote, doesn't matter if I vote.

NOMATTE3 NOMATTER collapsed: 1. Agree, 2. Agree/Disagree, 3. Disagree

NOWIN F13. Not imp't to vote if your party doesn't have chance to win.

NOWIN3 NOWIN collapsed: 0,1=1. Agree, 2=2. Agree/Disagree, 3,4=3. Disagree

VOTEDUTY F15. Citizens of this country have a duty to vote.

VOTDUTY3 VOTEDUTY collapsed: 1. Agree, 2. Agree/Disagree, 3. Disagree

CDUTY NOLOCAL + NOMATTER + NOWIN + VOTEDUTY
 Kronbach's alpha = .7577

CDUTY4 CDUTY collapsed: low-4=0. None, 5-8=1. Low, 9-11=2. Medium, 12-16=3. High
 (NOCARE deleted from scale; its presence reduced reliability to .6797)

CHAFFEE CONCEPT VARIABLES AND SCALE: H20. My parents... 1. Never, 2. Rarely, 3. Seldom, 4. Often.

DECIDE ...encouraged participation in family decisions.
 DECIDE3 DECIDE collapsed: 1,2=1. Rarely, 3=2. Occasionally, 4=3. Frequently.
 DEVADV ...played devil's advocate.
 DEVADV3 DEVADV collapsed: 1,2=1. Rarely, 3=2. Occasionally, 4=3. Frequently.
 DISCUSS ...encouraged me to participate in political discussions.
 DISCUSS3 DISCUSS collapsed: 1,2=1. Rarely, 3=2. Occasionally, 4=3. Frequently.
 EXPRESS ...encouraged me to get my ideas across.
 EXPRESS3 EXPRESS collapsed: 1,2=1. Rarely, 3=2. Occasionally, 4=3. Frequently.
 TWOSIDES ...encouraged me to look at both sides.
 TWOSIDE3 TWOSIDES collapsed: 1,2=1. Rarely, 3=2. Occasionally, 4=3. Frequently.
 VISIT ...visited people who disagreed with them.
 VISIT3 VISIT collapsed: 1,2=1. Rarely, 3=2. Occasionally, 4=3. Frequently.

CONCEPT DECIDE + DEVADV + DISCUSS + EXPRESS + TWOSIDES + VISIT
 Kronbach's alpha = .7495
 CONCEPT4 CONCEPT collapsed: 6=0. None, 7-12=1. Low, 13-16=2. Medium, 17-hi=3. High
 CONCEPT2 CONCEPT collapsed: 6-13=1. Low, 14-22=2. High

Related variable:

PSCOMMUN F17. When I was growing up, politics was frequently discussed in our house.
 0. Strongly Agree, 1. Agree, 2. A/D, 3. Disagree, 4. Strongly Disagree
 PSCOMMU3 PSCOMMUN collapsed: 0,1=1. Agree, 2=2. Agree/Disagree, 3,4=3. Disagree
 PSKOM1 PSCOMMUN recoded: 0.St. Disagree, 1. Disagree, 2. A/D, 3. Agree, 4.St. Agree

CHAFFEE SOCIO VARIABLES AND SCALE: H20. My parents... 1. Never, 2. Rarely, 3. Seldom, 4. Often

ANGER ...encouraged me to show anger in group situations.
 ANGER3 ANGER collapsed: 1,2=1. Rarely, 3=2. Occasionally, 4=3. Frequently
 ARGUE ...encouraged me to argue with those older.
 ARGUE3 ARGUE collapsed: 1. Rarely, 2. Occasionally, 3. Frequently.
 AVOIDCON ...encouraged me to avoid conflict.
 AVOIDCO3 AVOIDCON collapsed: 1,2=1. Rarely, 3=2. Occasionally, 4=3. Frequently.
 CHALPARS ...encouraged me to challenge opinions.
 CHALPAR3 CHALPARS collapsed: 1,2=1. Rarely, 3=2. Occasionally, 4=3. Frequently.
 GIVEIN ...encouraged me to give in on arguments.
 Recoded: 4. Never 3. Rarely 2. Seldom 1. Often

SOCIO ARGUE + CHALPARS (abbreviated Chaffee Scale)
 Kronbach's alpha = .7667
 SOCIO2 SOCIO collapsed: 2-4=1. Low, 5-8=2. High
 (Original scale: ANGER + ARGUE + AVOIDCON + CHALPARS + GIVEIN
 Kronbach's alpha = .3932)

Related scale using primarily CHAFFEE variables:

POLCOMM ARGUE + DISCUSS + EXPRESS + PSKOM1 + VISIT
 Kronbach's alpha = .7165
 POLCOMM3 POLCOMM collapsed: 0-5=0. None, 6-10=1. Low, 11-15=2. Med, 16-20=3. High

CHANGE VARIABLES: 0. no change, 1. less, 2. more

CHCOMPRO Compare COMPROB1 and COMPROB2.
 CHCONTAC Compare CONTACT1 and CONTACT2.
 CHGROUP Compare GROUP1 and GROUP2.
 CHGPLDR Compare GPLDR1 and GPLDR2.
 CHLISTEN Compare LISTEN1 and LISTEN2.
 CHMONEY Compare MONEY1 and MONEY2.
 CHMTGS Compare MTGS1 and MTGS2.
 CHPOLINT Compare POLINT1 and POLINT2.
 CHPOVIEW E6. Since age 60, are you [ideologically] (c) same? 0. no, 1. yes
 CHPROTES Compare PROTEST1 and PROTEST2.
 CHREAD Compare READ1 and READ2.
 CHTVNEWS Compare TVNEWS1 and TVNEWS2.
 CHTVSHOW Compare TVSHOW1 and TVSHOW2.
 CHVOTLOC Compare VOTLOC1 and VOTLOC2.
 CHVOTNAT Compare VOTNAT1 and VOTNAT2.
 CHVOTPRI Compare VOTPRI1 and VOTPRI2.
 CHWORK Compare WORK1 and WORK2.

DAD RELATIONSHIP VARIABLES AND SCALES: H21. Relationship?... 0. No, 1. Yes

DANGRY Angry/Irritable.
 DCOLD Cold/Harsh/Distant.
 DDEMAND Demanding (High Expectations).
 DHAPPY Happy.
 DINDEP Independent.
 DINDIFF Indifferent.
 DLAX Permissive.
 DLAXR DLAX recoded: 0. Yes, 1. No.
 DNAG Nagging/Stressful.
 DNOTSAME Unpredictable/Inconsistent.
 DOPEN Honest/Open/Trusting.
 DOVERPRO Overprotective.
 DSAME Predictable/Consistent.
 DSECRET Secretive/Distrustful.
 DSTERN Stern/Strict/Controlling.
 DSUPPORT Supportive/Encouraging.
 DVIOLENT Violent/Abusive/Threatening.

DADWARM DOPEN + DSAME + DSUPPORT + DWARM
 Kronbach's alpha = .8
 Coded: 1=1. Low, 2=2. Medium, 3-4=3. High

DSTRESS DANGRY + DDEMAND + DNAG+ DNOTSAME + DSTERN + DVIOLENT
 Kronbach's alpha = .4423

DSTRESS4 DSTRESS collapsed: 0=0. None, 1-2=1. Low, 3-4=2. Medium, 5-6=3. High

DAD'S POLITICAL ACTIVITY VARIABLES AND SCALE: H19. Frequently?...

0. No, 1. Yes

DADCONT contacted politicians.
 DADMONEY contributed money.
 DADMTGS attended political meetings.
 DADPROBS helped solve community problems.
 DADPROT demonstrated.
 DADWORK worked in election campaigns.
 DADREAD read political news.
 DADVOTE voted.

DPOLACT DADCONT + DADMONEY + DADMTGS + DADPROBS + DADPROT + DADWORK
 Kronbach's alpha = .72

DPOLACT4 DPOLACT collapsed: 0=0. None, 1-2=1. Low, 3-4=2. Medium, 5-6=3. High

DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES:

ADULTS H2. Adults in household during your childhood? 1=1, 2=2...9=9 & GT9

AGE A8. Birth year?

AGE3 Age: 1. 61-70, 2. 71-80, 3. 81-high

AGE7 Age: 1. 61-65, 2. 66-70, 3. 71-75, 4. 76-80, 5. 81-85, 6. 86-90, 7. 91-high

BIRTHNO H4. Birth order? 1. oldest/only, 2. middle, 3. youngest

CHILDREN H3. Children in your family? 1=1, 2=2...9=9 & GT9

CLASS G7. Class? 0. Wkg, 1. Lower MC, 2. Middle, 3. Upper MC, 4. Upper, 5. None

COUNTY A2. Residence? 0. Arlington, 1. St.M, 2. Montgomery, 3. PG, 4. Wash D.C.

COUNTY3 COUNTY collapsed: 0=0. Arlington, 1=1. St Mary's, 2-4=3. Panthers

EDUC G8. Level? 0. LT HS, 1. HS, 2. 12-16, 3. BA/BS, 4. MA, 5. MA+

EDUC3 EDUC collapsed: 0-1=1. LT HS/HS, 2-3=2. College 4-5=3. Grad School

EMPLOYED A9. Are you currently employed? 0. No, 1. Yes

ENGLISH A7. Is English your native language? 0. No, 1. Yes

FREETIME G16. Personal time in day? 0. LT 1 hr, 1. 1-2, 2. 3-5, 3. GT 5

GRKIDS G5. Do you have grandchildren? 0. No, 1. Yes

HEALTH G9. Describe your health? 0. Poor, 1. Fair, 2. Good, 3. Excellent

INCOME G6. 0. LT 10000, 1. 10-29999, 2. 30-49999, 3. 50-75000, 4. GT 75000

LVALONE G3. Do you live alone? 0. No, 1. Yes

LVNOW A3. Recoded: 0. Rural, 1. Sm Town, 2. Lg Town, 3. Suburban, 4. Urban

LVYRS A4. Years lived in community? 0. LT 5, 1. 5-10, 2. GT 10

MARRIED G2. 0. Widowed, Divorced, Separated, 1. Never Married, 2. Married

MARRIED2 MARRIED collapsed: 0. No, 1. Yes

PSLIVE G1. Area raised? 0. Rural, 1. Sm Town, 2. Lg Town, 3. Urban, 4. Suburban
Recoded: 0. Rural, 1. Sm Town, 2. Lg Town, 3. Suburban, 4. Urban

RACE A6. 0. White, 1. Black, 2. Hispanic, 3. Other

RAISEDBY H1. Raised by? 0. Mother & Father, 1. Mother, 2. Father, 3. Other

RECCTR G11. Social Center? 0. Never, 1. Rarely, 2. Frequently, 3. Daily

RESNOW A5. Live? 0. Private, 1. Ret Community, 2. Nursing Home, 3. Other

SEX A1. 0. Male, 1. Female

EXTERNAL EFFICACY VARIABLES AND SCALE: Coded: 0. Strongly Agree,
1. Agree, 2. Agree/Disagree, 3. Disagree, 4. Strongly Disagree

LUZTOUCH F9. Our representatives in Congress lose touch with the people.

LUZTOUC3 LUZTOUCH collapsed: 0,1=1. Agree, 2=2. Agree/Disagree, 3,4=3. Disagree

POLSCARE F8. Public officials care about what people like me think.

POLSCAR3 POLSCARE collapsed: 0,1=1. Agree, 2=2. Agree/Disagree, 3,4=3. Disagree

POLVOTES F10. Politicians only interested in votes not opinions.

POLVOTE3 POLVOTES collapsed: 0,1=1. Agree, 2=2. Agree/Disagree, 3,4=3. Disagree

EXTEFF LUZTOUCH + POLSCARE + POLVOTES
Kronbach's alpha = .7577

EXTEFF3 EXTEFF collapsed: 0-4=1. Low, 5-8=2. Medium, 9-12=3. High

GROUP/PEER VARIABLES AND SCALE: Coded: 0. No, 1. Yes

BUDSPA G14. Number of pol active friends? 0. none, 1. few, 2. majority, 3. all
 GROUP1 D3. Before age 60, were you a member of any organizations or groups?
 GROUP2 D5. Since age 60, have you joined, or continued mbrship, in any groups?
 GPLDR1 D4. Did you hold an elected position at any time before age 60?
 GPLDR2 D6. Have you held an elected position at any time since age 60?
 MBRAARP D7. Are you a member of? a. AARP.
 MBRGP D7. Are you a member of? e. Gray Panthers.
 MBRPOLGP D7. Are you a member of? f. another politically active group?
 SAMEBUDS G13. Are most your friends the same ones you have always had?
 SPOUSEPA G15. Would you describe your spouse as politically active?

GROUP GROUP1 + GROUP2 + GPLDR1 + GPLDR2
 Kronbach's alpha = .6730
 GROUP3 GROUP collapsed: 0-1=1. Low, 2=2. Medium, 3-4=3. High

IDEOLOGY VARIABLES: Coded according to Michigan 7-pt scale: 1. Extremely Conservative 2. Con, 3. Slightly Con, 4. Moderate, 5. Slightly Lib, 6. Lib, 7. Ex Liberal

MORECON E6. Since age 60, are you (b) more conservative? 0. No, 1. Yes
 MORELIB E6. Since age 60, are you (a) more liberal? 0. No, 1. Yes
 POLVIEW7 E5. Before 60, where were you on ideological scale? (7 pt scale)
 POLVIEW3 POLVIEW7 collapsed: 1-3=1. Conservative, 4=2. Moderate, 5-7= Liberal
 PVDAD H16. Place father on ideological scale. (7 point scale)
 PVDAD3 PVDAD collapsed: 1-3=1. Conservative, 4=2. Moderate, 5-7= Liberal
 PVFOLD POLVIEW7 folded: 1,7=4. Strong, 2,6=3. Medium, 3,5=2. Slight 4=1. Moderate
 PVMOM H16. Place mother on ideological scale. (7 point scale)
 PVMOM3 PVMOM collapsed: 1-3=1. Conservative, 4=2. Moderate, 5-7= Liberal

INTERNAL EFFICACY VARIABLES AND SCALE: Coded: 0. Strongly Agree, 1. Agree, 2. Agree/Disagree, 3. Disagree, 4. Strongly Disagree

COMPLEX F7. Politics is too complicated for a person like me to understand.
 COMPLEX3 COMPLEX collapsed: 0,1=1. Agree, 2=2. Agree/Disagree, 3,4=3. Disagree
 NOSAY F6. People like me don't have any say.
 NOSAY3 NOSAY collapsed: 1. Agree, 2. Agree/Disagree, 3. Disagree
 VOTEONLY F5. Voting only way people like me can have any say.
 VOTONLY3 VOTEONLY collapsed: 1. Agree, 2. Agree/Disagree, 3. Disagree
 INTEFF COMPLEX + NOSAY + VOTEONLY
 Kronbach's alpha = .7577
 INTEFF3 INTEFF collapsed: 0-4=1. Low, 5-8=2. Medium, 9-12=3. High

MOTHER RELATIONSHIP VARIABLES AND SCALES: H21. Relationship?... 0. No, 1. Yes

MANGRY Angry/Irritable.
 MCOLD Cold/Harsh/Distant.
 MDEMAND Demanding (High Expectations).
 MHAPPY Happy.
 MINDEP Independent.
 MINDIFF Indifferent.
 MLAX Permissive.
 MLAXR MLAX reversed. 0. Yes, 1. No
 MNAG Nagging/Stressful.
 MNOTSAME Unpredictable/Inconsistent.
 MOPEN Honest/Open/Trusting.
 MOVERPRO Overprotective.
 MSAME Predictable/Consistent.
 MSECRET Secretive/Distrustful.
 MSTERN Stern/Strict/Controlling.
 MSUPPORT Supportive/Encouraging.
 MVIOLENT Violent/Abusive/Threatening.
 MWARM Warm/Loving/Kind.

MALOOF MCOLD + MINDIFF + MSECRET
 Kronbach's alpha = .73
 MALOOF coded: 1. Low, 2. Medium, 3. High

MOMWARM MOPEN + MSAME + MSUPPORT + MWARM
 Kronbach's alpha = .83
 MOMWARM3 MOMWARM coded: 1,2=1. Low, 3=2. Medium, 4=3. High

MSTRESS MANGRY + MDEMAND + MNAG + MNOTSAME + MSTERN + MVIOLENT
 Kronbach's alpha = .63
 MSTRESS3 MSTRESS collapsed: 0=1=1. Low, 2-3=2. Medium, 4-6=3. High

MOTHER'S POLITICAL ACTIVITY VARIABLES: H18. Frequently?... 0. No, 1. Yes

MOMCONT contacted politicians.
 MOMMONEY contributed money.
 MOMMTGS attended political meetings.
 MOMPROBS helped solve community problems.
 MOMPROT demonstrated.
 MOMWORK worked in election campaigns.
 MOMREAD read political news.
 MOMVOTE voted.

MPOLACT MOMCONT + MOMMONEY + MOMMTGS + MOMPROBS + MOMPROT + MOMWORK
 Kronbach's alpha = .72
 MPOLACT4 MPOLACT collapsed: 0=0. None, 1-2=1. Low, 3-4=2. Medium, 5-6=3. High

OLINER SOCIALIZATION VARIABLES:

RESPON H23. Adult responsibility? 1. Pre 10, 2. 10-15, 2. 16-21, 3. GT 21.
 PUNISH H22. Response? 1. Talk, 2. Room, 3. 1&2, 4. Light, 5. 1&4, 6. Harsh, 7. 1&6
 PARSVOL H10. Did parents volunteer when you were growing up? 0. No, 1. Yes
 TEENVOL H9. You volunteer as a teenager? 0. No, 1. Yes

PARENT RELATIONSHIP VARIABLES AND SCALE: H21. Relationship between parents?... 0. No, 1. Yes

MDANGRY Angry/Irritable.
 MDCOLD Cold/Harsh/Distant.
 MDDEMAND Demanding (High Expectations).
 MDHAPPY Happy.
 MDINDEP Independent.
 MDINDIFF Indifferent.
 MDLAX Permissive.
 MDNAG Nagging/Stressful.
 MDNOTSAM Unpredictable/Inconsistent.
 MDOPEN Honest/Open/Trusting.
 MDOVERPR Overprotective.
 MDSAME Predictable/Consistent.
 MDSECRET Secretive/Distrustful.
 MDSTERN Stern/Strict/Controlling.
 MDSUPPOR Supportive/Encouraging.
 MDVIOLEN Violent/Abusive/Threatening.
 MDWARM Warm/Loving/Kind.

PARSWARM MOPEN + MSAME + MSUPPORT + MWARM
 Kronbach's alpha = .7927
 PARSWARM3 PARSWARM coded: 0-1=1. Low, 2=2. Medium, 3-4=3. High

PARTY IDENTIFICATION VARIABLES: Based on Michigan 7-pt scale: 1. Strong Republican, 2. Rep, 3. Indep Rep, 4. Indep., 5. Indep Dem, 6. Dem, 7. Strong Democrat.

PID7 E2-4. Place yourself on political party scale.
 PID3 PID7 collapsed: 1-3=1. Repub, 4=2. Indep, 5-7=3. Democrat
 PIDFOLD PID7 folded: 1,7=4. Str Partisan, 2,6=3. Part., 3,5=2. Wk Part., 4=1. Indep.
 PIDDAD3 PIDDAD7 collapsed to 3 point scale.
 PIDDAD7 H8. Place father on political party scale. (7 point scale)
 PIDMOM3 PIDMOM7 collapsed to 3 point scale.
 PIDMOM7 H7. Place mother on political party scale. (7 point scale)
 OTHERPID E2-4. Mbr of another party? 0. Socialist, 1. Communist, 2. Other
 OTPIDDAD H8. Dad member of another party? 0. Socialist, 1. Communist, 2. Other
 OTPIDMOM H7. Mom member of another party? 0. Socialist, 1. Communist, 2. Other

PARENT'S IDEOLOGY AND PARTY IDENTIFICATION SCALE:

- MDPIDPV PIDDAD + PIDMOM + PVMOM + PVDAD
 Kronbach's alpha = .7337
 Coded: 0-4=1. XC/SR, 5-8=2. C/R, 9-12=3. SC/IR, 13-16=4. M/I,
 17-20=5. SL/ID, 21-24=6. L/D, 25-28=7. XL/SD.
- MDPIDPV3 MDPIDPV collapsed: 0-12=1. Cons/Repub, 13-16=2. Mod/Indep, 17-28=3. L/D
- MDPIDPVF MDPIDPV folded: 1,7=4. Str part./Ideologue, 2,6=3, 3,5=2, 4=1. Indep/Mod.

POLITICAL ACTIVITY DIMENSION VARIABLES AND SCALES: Coded: 1. Never, 2. Rarely, 3. Often, 4. Frequently, 5. Always

- COMPROB1 B1i. Before age 60, worked with others to solve community problems
- COMPROB2 B1m. Since age 60, worked with others to solve community problems.
- CONTACT1 B1m. Before age 60, personally contacted politicians.
- CONTACT2 B1m. Since age 60, personally contacted politicians.
- MONEY1 B1m. Before age 60, contributed money to parties, candidates, causes.
- MONEY2 B1m. Since age 60, contributed money to parties, candidates, causes.
- MTGS1 B1m. Before age 60, attended political meetings or rallies.
- MTGS2 B1m. Since age 60, attended political meetings or rallies.
- PROTEST1 B1m. Before age 60, demonstrated on behalf of a particular cause.
- PROTEST2 B1m. Since age 60, demonstrated on behalf of a particular cause.
- WORK1 B1k. Before age 60, worked in election campaigns.
- WORK2 B2k. Since age 60, worked in election campaigns.
- POLACT1 COMPROB1 + CONTACT1 + MONEY1 + MTGS1 + PROTEST1 + WORK1
 Kronbach's alpha = .8723
- POLACT1A POLACT1 collapsed: 0=0. None, 6-10=1. Low, 11-17=2. Medium, 18-30=3. High
- POLACT2 COMPROB2 + CONTACT2 + MONEY2 + MTGS2 + PROTEST2 + WORK2
 Kronbach's alpha = .8599
- POLACT2A POLACT2 collapsed: 0=0. None, 6-10=1. Low, 11-17=2. Medium, 18-30=3. High

POLITICAL ATTENTION DIMENSION VARIABLES AND SCALES: Coded: 1. Never, 2. Rarely, 3. Often, 4. Frequently, 5. Always

- LISTEN1 B1d. Before age 60, listened to political talk radio.
- LISTEN2 B2d. Since age 60, listened to political talk radio.
- READ1 B1c. Before age 60, read political news in papers and/or magazines.
- READ2 B2c. Since age 60, read political news in papers and/or magazines.
- TVNEWS1 B1a. Before age 60, watched TV news.
- TVNEWS2 B2a. Since age 60, watched TV news.
- TVSHOW1 B1b. Before age 60, watched TV political shows such as McNeil-Lehrer.
- TVSHOW2 B2b. Since age 60, watched TV political shows such as McNeil-Lehrer.
- POLATTN1 LISTEN1 + READ1 + TVNEWS1 + TVSHOW1
 Kronbach's alpha = .5919

POLATTN2 LISTEN2 + READ2 + TVNEWS2 + TVSHOW2
 Kronbach's alpha = .6135
 POLATN2A POLATTN2 collapsed: 0=0. None, 6-12=1. Low, 13-16=2. Medium, 17-20=3. High

POLITICAL INTEREST VARIABLES: Coded: 1. Never, 2. Rarely, 3. Often,
 4. Frequently, 5. Always

POLINT1 D1. Before age 60, how interested were you in public affairs?
 POLINT1A POLINT1 collapsed: 1-2=1. Rarely, 3=2. Occasionally, 4-5=3. Frequently
 POLINT2 D2. Since age 60, how interested are you in public affairs?
 POLINT2A POLINT2 collapsed: 1-2=1. Rarely, 3=2. Occasionally, 4-5=3. Frequently

POWER VARIABLES: Recoded... 1. Almost no one... 6. Yes, Anyone

POWERDAD H6. Could your father make anyone do what he wanted them to do?
 POWERDA3 POWERDAD collapsed: 1-2=1. Low, 3-4=2. Medium, 5-6=3. High.
 POWERMOM H5. Could your mother make anyone do what she wanted them to do?
 POWERMO3 POWERMOM collapsed: 1-2=1. Low, 3-4=2. Medium, 5-6=3. High.

RELIGION VARIABLES:

DENOMNOW H14. Religious preference? 0. P, 1. RC, 2. Jew, 3. Unit. 4. Other, 5. None
 GODIMPT H15. How important is God in your life? 0. Not, 1. Somewhat, 2. Very.
 MASSREG H12. Attend religious services regularly as a child? 0. No, 1. Yes
 PARSREL H11. Were either of your parents deeply religious? 0. No, 1. Yes
 PSDENOM H13. Raised relig denom? 0. P, 1. RC, 2. Jew, 3. Unit. 4. Other, 5. None

TRUST VARIABLES AND SCALE: F20. I have faith in... 0. No, 1. Yes

TRUSTCON c. Congress as a whole.
 TRUSTLG f. Local Government.
 TRUSTPP a. Political Parties.
 TRUSTPZ d. President.
 TRUSTREP g. My State Senators and Representatives in Congress.
 TRUSTSC b. The Supreme Court.
 TRUSTSG e. State Government.

TRUST TRUSTCON+ TRUSTLG+ TRUSTPP + TRUSTPZ + TRUSTREP + TRUSTSC+ TRUSTSG
 Kronbach's alpha = .8826
 TRUST4 TRUST collapsed: 0=0. None, 1-2=1. Low, 3-5=2. Medium, 6-7=3. High

VOTING DIMENSION VARIABLES AND SCALES: Coded: 1. Never, 2. Rarely,
3. Often, 4. Frequently, 5. Always

VOTLOC1	B1e. Before age 60, voted in local and/or state elections.
VOTLOC2	B2e. Since age 60, voted in local and/or state elections.
VOTNAT1	B1g. Before age 60, voted in national elections.
VOTNAT2	B2g. Since age 60, voted in national elections.
VOTPRI1	B1f. Before age 60, voted in primaries and/or caucuses.
VOTPRI2	B2f. Since age 60, voted in primaries and/or caucuses.
 VOTE1	 VOTLOC1 + VOTPRI1 + VOTNAT1 Kronbach's alpha = .7702
VOTE1A	VOTE1 collapsed: 0-3=0. None, 4-6=1. Low, 7-12=2. Medium, 13-15=3. High
 VOTE2	 VOTLOC2 + VOTPRI2 + VOTNAT2 Kronbach's alpha = .7787
VOTE2A	VOTE2 collapsed: 0-3=0. None, 4-6=1. Low, 7-12=2. Medium, 13-15=3. High

APPENDIX C

CORRELATION COEFFICIENT TABLES

TABLE I: CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS FOR SUBSAMPLES:
CORRELATION BETWEEN INDEPENDENT VARIABLES AND GRAY
PANTHERS. ARLINGTON AND ST MARY'S COUNTY RESIDENTS

TABLE II: CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS FOR POLITICAL ENGAGEMENT
DIMENSIONS (AFTER 60): CORRELATION BETWEEN
INDEPENDENT VARIABLES AND POLITICAL ACTIVITY,
POLITICAL ATTENTION, AND VOTING ACTIVITY

TABLE I: CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS FOR SUBSAMPLES

VARIABLES	CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS (Kendall's Tau)		
	Panthers	Arlington	St Mary's
ADULTS	neg .0320 (.604)	neg .0502 (.417)	.0587 (.342)
AGE	.1144 (.014)	neg .0160 (.732)	neg .1188 (.011)
ANGER	neg .0255 (.705)	neg .0336 (.618)	.0628 (.352)
ARGUE	.1513 (.023)	neg .0564 (.396)	neg .1324 (.046)
AVOIDCON	neg .0114 (.857)	.0078 (.902)	neg .0134 (.832)
BIRTHNO	neg .0080 (.897)	.0134 (.828)	.0202 (.745)
BUDSPA	.4814 (.000)	neg .2345 (.000)	neg .2198 (.000)
CDUTY	.3096 (.000)	neg .0976 (.049)	neg .2215 (.000)
CHALPARS	.1075 (.104)	neg .1127 (.089)	neg .0259 (.696)
CHILDREN	.0131 (.825)	.0554 (.351)	neg .0559 (.147)
CONCEPT	.0144 (.847)	.0007 (.991)	.1110 (.049)
DADREAD	.1030 (.131)	neg .1081 (.113)	neg .0237 (.728)
DADVOTE	neg .1289 (.060)	.0892 (.193)	.0516 (.452)
DADWARM	neg .1789 (.004)	neg .0627 (.307)	.2616 (.000)
DALOOF	.0238 (.725)	.1298 (.055)	neg .1933 (.004)
DANGRY	neg .0737 (.283)	.0538 (.434)	neg .0089 (.896)
DCOLD	neg .0941 (.171)	.1337 (.052)	neg .0859 (.211)
DDEMAND	.0142 (.836)	.1154 (.093)	neg .1134 (.099)
DECIDE	neg .0859 (.175)	.0265 (.676)	.0859 (.175)
DENOMNOW	.4004 (.000)	neg .1417 (.018)	neg .2998 (.000)

VARIABLES	CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS (Kendall's Tau)		
	Panthers	Arlington	St Mary's
DEVADV	neg .0307 (.647)	.0328 (.625)	neg .0213 (.751)
DHAPPY	neg .1244 (.070)	neg .1208 (.079)	.2639 (.000)
DINDEP	neg .1082 (.116)	.0612 (.374)	.0286 (.678)
DINDIFF	neg .0194 (.778)	.1105 (.108)	neg .1343 (.051)
DISCUSS	.1465 (.020)	neg .0636 (.312)	neg .0850 (.176)
DLAX	.1644 (.017)	neg .0359 (.602)	neg .1681 (.014)
DIAG	neg .0644 (.348)	.1132 (.099)	neg .0474 (.490)
DNOTSAME	.0484 (.482)	.1052 (.126)	neg .1632 (.018)
DOPEN	neg .2200 (.001)	neg .0178 (.796)	.2616 (.000)
DOVERPRO	.0954 (.166)	neg .0828 (.229)	neg .0189 (.784)
DPOLACT	neg .0036 (.955)	neg .0402 (.526)	.0720 (.256)
DSAME	neg .2256 (.001)	.0289 (.674)	.2189 (.001)
DSECRET	neg .0027 (.969)	.0934 (.174)	neg .0948 (.167)
DSTERN	neg .0863 (.209)	.0125 (.856)	.1052 (.126)
DSTRESS	neg .0147 (.821)	.0382 (.557)	neg .0002 (.998)
DSUPPORT	.0029 (.966)	neg .0564 (.411)	.0788 (.251)
DVIOLENT	neg .0267 (.698)	.0675 (.327)	neg .0409 (.552)
DWARM	neg .0608 (.376)	neg .1353 (.049)	.2088 (.002)
EDUC	.1482 (.003)	neg .0032 (.949)	neg .1595 (.002)
EXPRESS	.0466 (.470)	.0166 (.796)	neg .0877 (.174)
EXTEFF	neg .0331 (.501)	.1910 (.000)	neg .1624 (.001)
FAMCLOSE	neg .0864 (.124)	neg .0718 (.201)	.1302 (.020)
FREETIME	neg .0054 (.919)	.0516 (.330)	neg .0420 (.427)
GIVEIN	neg .0145 (.820)	.0120 (.851)	neg .0061 (.924)
GODIMPT	neg .4361 (.000)	.1416 (.023)	.3350 (.000)
GPLDR1	.1238 (.027)	neg .1270 (.024)	.0089 (.874)
GPLDR2	.1922 (.001)	neg .1782 (.001)	neg .0198 (.724)
GRKIDS	.1483 (.008)	neg .2777 (.000)	.1424 (.011)
GROUP	.1855 (.000)	neg .1942 (.000)	.0152 (.766)
GROUP1	.0548 (.328)	neg .1229 (.028)	.0737 (.189)

VARIABLES	CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS (Kendall's Tau)		
	Panthers	Arlington	St Mary's
GROUP2	.2309 (.000)	neg .2379 (.000)	.0351 (.531)
HEALTH	neg .0081 (.880)	neg .0096 (.858)	neg .0096 (.858)
INCOME	.1352 (.009)	.0056 (.913)	.1158 (.025)
INTEFF	.2013 (.000)	neg .0608 (.216)	neg .1241 (.012)
LVALONE	.0830 (.139)	.1382 (.014)	neg .1864 (.001)
LVNOW	.1519 (.004)	.3916 (.000)	neg .5663 (.000)
LVYRS	.0611 (.269)	neg .0408 (.460)	neg .0424 (.443)
MALOOFF	.0155 (.813)	.0136 (.836)	neg .0349 (.593)
MANGRY	.0617 (.353)	neg .0678 (.307)	neg .0004 (.995)
MARRIED	neg .1041 (.064)	neg .2027 (.000)	.2766 (.000)
MASSREG	neg .3799 (.000)	.1902 (.004)	.2217 (.001)
MBRAARP	neg .1386 (.013)	.0452 (.421)	.0750 (.181)
MCOLD	.0540 (.416)	neg .0437 (.510)	neg .0162 (.808)
MDANGRY	neg .0527 (.451)	.0185 (.791)	.0335 (.632)
MDCOLD	.0711 (.308)	.0621 (.374)	neg .1461 (.037)
MDDEMAND	.0992 (.156)	neg .0254 (.716)	neg .0870 (.213)
MDEMAND	.1040 (.117)	.0343 (.605)	neg .1378 (.038)
MDHAPPY	neg .2106 (.003)	neg .1397 (.045)	.3431 (.000)
MDINDEP	.0445 (.524)	neg .0184 (.793)	neg .0633 (.365)
MDINDIFF	.0871 (.212)	.0242 (.729)	neg .1239 (.076)
MDLAX	neg .0084 (.904)	.0949 (.174)	neg .1295 (.064)
MDNAG	.1143 (.102)	.0453 (.517)	neg .1783 (.011)
MDNOTSAM	.0711 (.308)	neg .0518 (.458)	neg .0278 (.691)
MDOPEN	neg .1747 (.012)	neg .0050 (.943)	.1652 (.018)
MDOVERPR	neg .1028 (.141)	.1033 (.139)	.0038 (.957)
MDPIDPV	.3662 (.000)	neg .1246 (.054)	neg .2393 (.000)
MDPIDPVF	.1912 (.004)	neg .0676 (.312)	neg .1089 (.103)
MDSAME	neg .1433 (.040)	.0093 (.894)	.1374 (.049)
MDSECRET	neg .0149 (.831)	.0488 (.484)	neg .0377 (.590)
MDSTERN	.0258 (.712)	neg .0205 (.769)	neg .0119 (.864)

VARIABLES	CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS (Kendall's Tau)		
	Panthers	Arlington	St Mary's
MDSUPPOR	neg .2098 (.003)	.0567 (.417)	.1400 (.045)
MDVIOLEN	.0357 (.609)	.0257 (.713)	neg .0682 (.329)
MDWARM	neg .1505 (.031)	neg .0270 (.699)	.1835 (.009)
MHAPPY	neg .3109 (.000)	.1010 (.128)	.2229 (.001)
MINDEP	.0430 (.517)	.0027 (.967)	neg .0787 (.235)
MINDIFF	.0234 (.724)	.0188 (.777)	neg .0476 (.473)
MLAX	.0098 (.883)	.0483 (.467)	neg .0907 (.172)
MNAG	.2199 (.001)	neg .0661 (.319)	neg .1765 (.008)
MNOTSAME	neg .0022 (.973)	.0500 (.452)	neg .0529 (.425)
MOMREAD	.0202 (.765)	neg .0334 (.621)	.0043 (.949)
MOMVOTE	neg .2424 (.000)	.0327 (.628)	.2182 (.001)
MOMWARM	neg .2882 (.000)	.0703 (.237)	.2322 (.000)
MOPEN	neg .2639 (.000)	.0275 (.679)	.2497 (.000)
MOVERPRO	.0202 (.761)	.0004 (.995)	neg .0529 (.425)
MPOLACT	.1153 (.069)	neg .1480 (.020)	.0186 (.769)
MSAME	neg .2084 (.002)	.0756 (.255)	.1571 (.018)
MSECRET	.0702 (.290)	.0050 (.940)	neg .0849 (.201)
MSTERN	.0182 (.784)	neg .1082 (.103)	.1077 (.105)
MSTRESS	.0974 (.110)	neg .0436 (.474)	neg .0520 (.393)
MSUPPORT	neg .2058 (.002)	.0828 (.212)	.1263 (.057)
MVIOLENT	.0375 (.572)	.0205 (.757)	neg .0645 (.331)
MWARM	neg .2171 (.001)	.0080 (.903)	.2363 (.000)
PARSREL	neg .1954 (.003)	.0271 (.679)	.2079 (.002)
PARSVOL	neg .0377 (.565)	neg .0508 (.438)	.1334 (.042)
PARSWARM	neg .2224 (.000)	neg .0108 (.864)	.2254 (.000)
PID	.2571 (.000)	neg .1029 (.044)	neg .1831 (.000)
PIDDAD	neg .1476 (.003)	.1089 (.029)	.0421 (.400)
PIDFOLD	.0359 (.501)	.0258 (.629)	neg .0380 (.477)
PIDMOM	neg .0179 (.720)	.0891 (.074)	neg .0703 (.160)
POLACT1	.4770 (.000)	neg .2398 (.000)	neg .2088 (.000)

VARIABLES	CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS (Kendall's Tau)		
	Panthers	Arlington	St Mary's
POLACT2	.4770 (.000)	neg .2384 (.000)	neg .2079 (.000)
POLATTN1	.2661 (.000)	neg .0503 (.293)	neg .2048 (.000)
POLATTN2	.1811 (.000)	neg .0038 (.937)	neg .1523 (.001)
POLCOMM	.1262 (.034)	neg .0318 (.592)	neg .1145 (.054)
POLINT1	.4652 (.000)	neg .2030 (.000)	neg .2472 (.000)
POLINT2	.3705 (.000)	neg .2017 (.000)	neg .1603 (.003)
POLVIEW	.4757 (.000)	neg .1845 (.000)	neg .3304 (.000)
POWERDAD	neg .2517 (.000)	.1515 (.023)	.1592 (.017)
POWERMOM	neg .0325 (.616)	neg .0469 (.469)	.1062 (.101)
PSCOM1	.1415 (.006)	neg .0172 (.741)	neg .1287 (.013)
PSDENOM	.3732 (.000)	neg .2180 (.000)	neg .1964 (.001)
PSLIVE	.3256 (.000)	neg .1165 (.023)	neg .1906 (.000)
PUNISH	neg .0319 (.591)	neg .0007 (.990)	.0553 (.352)
PVDAD	.3190 (.000)	neg .1643 (.008)	neg .1826 (.003)
PVFOLD	.3943 (.000)	neg .1856 (.000)	neg .1937 (.000)
PVMOM	.2428 (.000)	neg .1424 (.019)	neg .1350 (.026)
RECCTR	.0143 (.786)	.1976 (.000)	neg .2096 (.000)
RESNOW	neg .0138 (.805)	.1036 (.064)	neg .0677 (.225)
RESPON	.0785 (.200)	neg .0567 (.355)	neg .0586 (.338)
SAMEBUDS	neg .0459 (.414)	neg .0421 (.453)	.0485 (.388)
SEX	.1634 (.004)	neg .0125 (.823)	neg .1360 (.015)
SOCIO	.1506 (.020)	neg .1117 (.084)	neg .0741 (.251)
SPOUSEPA	.2461 (.000)	neg .0014 (.980)	neg .2528 (.000)
TEENVOL	neg .0331 (.613)	.0207 (.752)	.0150 (.818)
TRUST	neg .1814 (.000)	.1556 (.002)	.0239 (.631)
TWOSIDES	neg .1609 (.012)	.0532 (.405)	.1078 (.092)
VISIT	.0702 (.276)	.0143 (.824)	neg .0775 (.229)
VOTE1	.4015 (.000)	neg .2250 (.000)	neg .1669 (.001)
VOTE2	.3348 (.000)	neg .2011 (.000)	neg .1278 (.014)

TABLE II: CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS FOR DIMENSIONS

VARIABLES	CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS (Kendall's Tau)		
	POLACT2	POLATTN2	VOTING2
ADULTS	neg .0761 (.141)	.0815 (.123)	.0263 (.652)
AGE	neg .0504 (.349)	neg .0219 (.585)	.0167 (.700)
ANGER	neg .0504 (.372)	neg .0243 (.674)	neg .0478 (.455)
ARGUE	.1740 (.002)	.0669 (.240)	.0583 (.354)
AVOIDCON	neg .1203 (.023)	neg .0532 (.328)	.0407 (.498)
BIRTHNO	neg .0965 (.063)	neg .0451 (.395)	.0072 (.903)
BUDSPA	.4232 (.000)	.1415 (.002)	.2876 (.000)
CDUTY	.2094 (.000)	.1812 (.000)	.3109 (.000)
CHALPARS	.0730 (.187)	.0086 (.879)	.0834 (.184)
CHILDREN	neg .0341 (.492)	.0236 (.642)	neg .0068 (.904)
CONCEPT	.0792 (.110)	.0583 (.250)	.0330 (.556)
DADREAD	.0463 (.417)	.0045 (.938)	.0107 (.869)
DADVOTE	neg .0636 (.268)	.0128 (.828)	neg .0461 (.480)
DADWARM	neg .0058 (.910)	.0910 (.084)	.0413 (.477)
DALOOF	neg .0193 (.733)	.0334 (.564)	neg .1114 (.082)
DANGRY	neg .0187 (.745)	neg .0549 (.350)	neg .0051 (.937)
DCOLD	neg .0484 (.400)	.0333 (.571)	neg .0583 (.370)
DDEMAND	neg .0472 (.412)	.1064 (.070)	.0235 (.718)
DECIDE	.0227 (.669)	.0776 (.153)	.0227 (.706)
DENOMNOW	.3059 (.000)	.0607 (.234)	.1210 (.032)
DEVADV	.0224 (.690)	.0295 (.607)	neg .0638 (.316)
DHAPPY	neg .0460 (.424)	.0742 (.207)	.0580 (.373)
DINDEP	neg .0288 (.617)	neg .0290 (.622)	.0047 (.942)
DINDIFF	neg .0047 (.934)	.0121 (.837)	neg .1363 (.036)
DISCUSS	.1593 (.002)	.0726 (.178)	.0482 (.420)
DLAX	.0983 (.087)	neg .0609 (.300)	.0692 (.288)
DNAG	neg .0913 (.112)	.0076 (.897)	.0361 (.579)

VARIABLES	CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS (Kendall's Tau)		
	POLACT2	POLATTN2	VOTING2
DNOTSAME	neg .0234 (.684)	.0526 (.372)	neg .0065 (.921)
DOPEN	neg .0396 (.492)	.0542 (.356)	.0090 (.890)
DOVERPRO	.0234 (.685)	neg .0517 (.380)	.0780 (.232)
DPOLACT	.1010 (.057)	.0515 (.342)	.0915 (.129)
DSAME	.0068 (.906)	.0539 (.359)	.0005 (.994)
DSECRET	neg .0152 (.791)	neg .0274 (.641)	neg .1250 (.055)
DSTERN	neg .1012 (.078)	.0635 (.280)	.0235 (.717)
DSTRESS	neg .0644 (.237)	.0792 (.155)	.0594 (.336)
DSUPPORT	.0620 (.281)	.1422 (.016)	neg .0106 (.871)
DVIOLENT	.0392 (.497)	neg .0142 (.809)	neg .1931 (.003)
DWARM	.0225 (.696)	.0695 (.237)	.1174 (.071)
EDUC	.1564 (.000)	.1002 (.021)	.1139 (.015)
EXPRESS	.0534 (.323)	.1675 (.002)	.2486 (.000)
EXTEFF	.0987 (.017)	neg .0035 (.934)	.0678 (.136)
FAMCLOSE	.0514 (.275)	neg .0093 (.847)	.0312 (.547)
FREETIME	.0526 (.235)	neg .0532 (.239)	.0328 (.502)
GIVEIN	neg .0899 (.092)	neg .0013 (.982)	neg .1668 (.006)
GODIMPT	neg .3365 (.000)	neg .1329 (.013)	neg .2059 (.000)
GPLDR1	.1482 (.002)	.1806 (.000)	.1915 (.000)
GPLDR2	.2935 (.000)	.1368 (.004)	.1513 (.004)
GRKIDS	.1690 (.000)	.0224 (.641)	.1163 (.025)
GROUP	.2930 (.000)	.1818 (.000)	.2083 (.000)
GROUP1	.2079 (.000)	.1446 (.003)	.1216 (.019)
GROUP2	.2937 (.000)	.1122 (.019)	.2013 (.000)
HEALTH	.0026 (.953)	neg .1104 (.016)	.0860 (.082)
INCOME	.0470 (.277)	.0630 (.153)	.0073 (.878)
INTEFF	.2428 (.000)	.0870 (.038)	.0404 (.374)
LVALONE	neg .0287 (.541)	neg .0019 (.968)	neg .0319 (.539)
LVNOW	.0698 (.131)	.0837 (.063)	neg .0189 (.699)
LVYRS	.0698 (.131)	.0112 (.812)	.1287 (.012)

VARIABLES	CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS (Kendall's Tau)		
	POLACT2	POLATTN2	VOTING2
MALOOF	neg .0465 (.395)	neg .0786 (.159)	neg .0791 (.201)
MANGRY	neg .0176 (.751)	neg .0497 (.381)	.0752 (.231)
MARRIED	.0741 (.115)	neg .0047 (.923)	.0515 (.321)
MASSREG	neg .1622 (.003)	.0540 (.334)	neg .0421 (.496)
MBRAARP	neg .1023 (.029)	.0084 (.861)	neg .0112 (.829)
MCOLD	neg .0206 (.711)	.0523 (.357)	.0163 (.795)
MDANGRY	neg .0387 (.508)	neg .0431 (.471)	neg .0250 (.706)
MDCOLD	neg .0687 (.240)	neg .0372 (.534)	neg .1101 (.096)
MDDEMAND	.0978 (.095)	.0584 (.328)	.0775 (.242)
MDEMAND	.0959 (.084)	.1310 (.021)	.0617 (.326)
MDHAPPY	neg .0153 (.793)	neg .0428 (.474)	.1187 (.073)
MDINDEP	.1328 (.023)	.0923 (.123)	.0523 (.430)
MDINDIFF	.0113 (.847)	neg .0031 (.959)	neg .0272 (.681)
MDLAX	.0573 (.328)	.0594 (.320)	.0663 (.317)
MDNAG	.0748 (.201)	neg .0043 (.943)	.0965 (.145)
MDNOTSAM	neg .0121 (.837)	.0359 (.548)	neg .0071 (.914)
MDOPEN	.0061 (.917)	.0448 (.454)	.0528 (.426)
MDOVERPR	neg .1004 (.086)	neg .0697 (.244)	neg .0679 (.305)
MDPIDPV	.1496 (.003)	.0095 (.855)	.1455 (.011)
MDPIDPVF	neg .0449 (.422)	neg .1411 (.014)	neg .0131 (.836)
MDSAME	neg .0020 (.973)	neg .0020 (.974)	neg .0020 (.974)
MDSECRET	neg .0845 (.149)	neg .0057 (.924)	neg .1009 (.128)
MDSTERN	.0778 (.184)	neg .0005 (.994)	.0153 (.817)
MDSUPPOR	neg .0867 (.138)	.0318 (.595)	.0229 (.729)
MDVIOLEN	.0011 (.985)	neg .0845 (.158)	neg .2172 (.001)
MDWARM	.0259 (.685)	neg .0875 (.143)	.0480 (.469)
MHAPPY	neg .1136 (.041)	.1007 (.076)	.0148 (.813)
MINDEP	.0773 (.165)	.0406 (.474)	.0782 (.213)
MINDIFF	neg .0042 (.940)	neg .0635 (.264)	neg .1356 (.031)
MLAX	neg .0118 (.831)	neg .0553 (.330)	.0174 (.781)

VARIABLES	CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS (Kendall's Tau)		
	POLACT2	POLATTN2	VOTING2
MNAG	.1149 (.039)	.1321 (.020)	.1101 (.079)
MNOTSAME	neg .1245 (.025)	.0451 (.427)	.1070 (.088)
MOMREAD	.0422 (.456)	.0213 (.713)	.0017 (.979)
MOMVOTE	neg .0963 (.088)	.0213 (.712)	.0075 (.907)
MOMWARM	neg .0791 (.113)	.0395 (.438)	neg .0501 (.373)
MOPEN	neg .1082 (.052)	neg .0047 (.933)	neg .0705 (.261)
MOVERPRO	.0097 (.861)	neg .0499 (.380)	.0644 (.305)
MPOLACT	.2172 (.000)	.1574 (.004)	.1696 (.005)
MSAME	.0065 (.907)	.0452 (.426)	neg .1056 (.092)
MSECRET	.0000 (.000)	neg .1611 (.005)	neg .0956 (.128)
MSTERN	neg .0093 (.868)	neg .0228 (.687)	.0420 (.503)
MSTRESS	.0291 (.568)	.0526 (.313)	.1005 (.081)
MSUPPORT	neg .0743 (.181)	.0702 (.216)	neg .0111 (.860)
MVIOLENT	neg .0070 (.900)	neg .0215 (.705)	.0079 (.900)
MWARM	neg .0583 (.294)	.0027 (.961)	.0031 (.961)
PARSREL	neg .0864 (.116)	.0129 (.819)	.0211 (.734)
PARSVOL	.0419 (.445)	.0376 (.502)	neg .0005 (.993)
PARSWARM	neg .0316 (.549)	.0039 (.942)	.0179 (.764)
PID	.2440 (.000)	.0669 (.126)	.2647 (.000)
PIDDA	neg .1702 (.000)	neg .1651 (.000)	neg .2381 (.000)
PIDFOLD	.1208 (.007)	.0054 (.906)	neg .0380 (.441)
PIDMOM	neg .0672 (.108)	neg .1081 (.011)	neg .1081 (.011)
POLACT1	.6910 (.000)	.2661 (.000)	.2982 (.000)
POLACT2	1	.2802 (.000)	.3113 (.000)
POLATTN1	.2246 (.000)	.6644 (.000)	.2702 (.000)
POLATTN2	0.4319	1	.2836 (.000)
POLCOMM	.1522 (.002)	.1070 (.036)	.1198 (.034)
POLINT1	.3971 (.000)	.2992 (.000)	.4178 (.000)
POLINT2	.3723 (.000)	.3458 (.000)	.4292 (.000)
POLVIEW	.3085 (.000)	.0944 (.026)	.3249 (.000)

VARIABLES	CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS (Kendall's Tau)		
	POLACT2	POLATTN2	VOTING2
POWERDAD	neg .1107 (.407)	.0256 (.653)	.0523 (.046)
POWERMOM	.0476 (.380)	.0293 (.597)	.0318 (.604)
PSCOM1	.1672 (.000)	.1678 (.000)	.2220 (.000)
PSDENOM	.2053 (.000)	.0221 (.670)	.1270 (.027)
PSLIVE	.1785 (.000)	.1625 (.000)	.1583 (.001)
PUNISH	.0496 (.318)	neg .0035 (.945)	.0530 (.346)
PVDAD	.1617 (.002)	.0245 (.643)	.1303 (.026)
PVFOLD	.2306 (.000)	.1071 (.016)	.1545 (.001)
PVMOM	.1598 (.002)	.0408 (.432)	.1309 (.023)
RECCTR	neg .0277 (.530)	neg .0274 (.541)	.0603 (.215)
RESNOW	neg .0706 (.131)	neg .0583 (.222)	neg .0560 (.278)
RESPON	.0195 (.704)	neg .0828 (.114)	neg .0560 (.278)
SAMEBUDS	neg .0259 (.582)	.0236 (.623)	.0728 (.160)
SEX	.0130 (.781)	.0736 (.124)	.0374 (.471)
SOCIO	.1515 (.005)	.0491 (.376)	.0945 (.124)
SPOUSEPA	.0834 (.061)	.0782 (.085)	.1000 (.042)
TEENVOL	.0617 (.260)	.1751 (.002)	.0023 (.970)
TRUST	neg .0562 (.177)	neg .0105 (.804)	.0234 (.609)
TWOSIDES	neg .0327 (.541)	neg .0452 (.409)	neg .1179 (.052)
VISIT	.0889 (.099)	neg .0159 (.773)	neg .0216 (.724)
VOTE1	.2980 (.000)	.2579 (.000)	.7801 (.000)
VOTE2	.3113 (.000)	.2836 (.000)	1

CONTINGENCY TABLES

INDEX (arranged alphabetically)

SECTION I: STUDY SAMPLES VERSUS ANES SAMPLE

- Ia. AGE
- Ib. EDUCATION
- Ic. IDEOLOGY
- Id. INCOME
- Ie. NOSAY
- If. PARTY IDENTIFICATION
- Ig. POLITICAL ACTIVITY SCALE
- Ih. RACE
- Ii. RELIGION
- Ij. SEX

SECTION II: SUBSAMPLES BY INDEPENDENT VARIABLES (IVs)

- IIa. COUNTY by AGE
- IIb. COUNTY by BUDSPA (Politically Active Friends)
- IIc. COUNTY by CDUTY4 (Civic Duty)
- IId. COUNTY by INCOME (Family Income)
- IIe. COUNTY by LVNOW (Area Individual Lives Now)
- IIf. COUNTY by POLATN2A (Political Attention Post 60)
- IIg. COUNTY by POLINT2A (Political Interest Post 60)
- IIh. COUNTY by SPOUSEPA (Politically Active Spouse)
- IIi. COUNTY by VOTE1A (Voting Activity Pre 60)
- IIj. COUNTY by VOTE2A (Voting Activity Post 60)

SECTION III: POLITICAL ACTIVITY POST 60 BY IVs

- IIIa. POLACT2A by BUDSPA (Politically Active Friends)
- IIIb. POLACT2A by MPOLACT4 (Mother's Political Activity)
- IIIc. POLACT2A by POLATN2A (Political Attention Post 60)
- IIId. POLACT2A by PSLIVE (Area Individual Was Raised)
- IIIe. POLACT2A by VOTE1A (Voting Activity Pre 60)
- IIIf. POLACT2A by VOTE2A (Voting Activity Post 60)

SECTION IV: POLITICAL ATTENTION POST 60 BY IVs

IVa. POLATN2A by CDUTY4 (Civic Duty)
 IVb. POLATN2A by GROUP3 (Group Involvement)
 IVc. POLATN2A by HEALTH (Health)
 IVd. POLATN2A by LVNOW (Area Individual Lives Now)
 IVe. POLATN2A by MPOLACT4 (Mother's Political Activity)
 IVf. POLATN2A by POLCOMM3 (Political Communication)
 IVg. POLATN2A by POLINT1A (Political Interest Pre 60)
 IVh. POLATN2A by POLINT2A (Political Interest Post 60)
 IVi. POLATN2A by POLATN2A (Political Attention Post 60)
 IVj. POLATN2A by PSLIVE (Area Individual Was Raised)

SECTION V: VOTING ACTIVITY POST 60 BY IVs

Va. VOTE2A by BUDSPA (Politically Active Friends)
 Vb. VOTE2A by EDUC (Education)
 Vc. VOTE2A by EXPRESS (Encouraged to Express Opinions)
 Vd. VOTE2A by GROUP3 (Group Involvement)
 Ve. VOTE2A by LVYRS (Years in the Community)
 Vf. VOTE2A by MPOLACT4 (Mother's Political Activity)
 Vg. VOTE2A by POLACT1A (Political Activity Pre 60)
 Vh. VOTE2A by POLACT2A (Political Activity Post 60)
 Vi. VOTE2A by POWERDAD (Perception of Father's Power)
 Vj. VOTE2A by PSLIVE (Area Individual Was Raised)

TABLE Ia. AGE

Value Label	ANES Sample		Study Sample		Study Subsamples					
	(n)	Percent	(n)	Percent	Arlington		St. Marys		Panthers	
61-70	288	48.6	105	32.9	46	38.3	38	38.4	21	21.0
71-80	211	35.6	157	49.2	51	42.5	50	50.5	56	56.0
81-90	93	15.7	57	17.9	23	19.2	11	11.1	23	23.0
totals	592	100.0	319	100.0	120	100.0	99	100.0	100	100.0
total sample N	592		319		120		99		100	
missing values	0		0		0		0		0	

TABLE Ib. EDUCATION

Value Label	By Age	ANES Sample		Study Sample		Study Subsamples					
		(n)	Percent	(n)	Percent	Arl'n		St. Marys		Panthers	
LT HS	61-70	95	16.6	3	1.0	1	0.8	2	2.0	0	0.0
	71-80	75	13.1	3	1.0	0	0.0	3	3.1	0	0.0
	81-100	52	9.1	4	1.3	1	0.8	0	0.0	3	3.0
subtotals		222	38.8	10	3.3	2	1.6	5	5.1	3	3.0
HS	61-70	104	18.2	11	3.5	1	0.8	7	7.1	3	3.0
	71-80	60	10.5	15	4.8	7	5.9	6	6.1	2	3.0
	81-100	21	3.8	8	2.5	4	3.4	2	2.0	2	2.0
subtotals		185	32.5	34	10.8	12	10.2	15	15.2	7	7.0
13-15	61-70	35	6.1	26	8.3	11	9.3	12	12.2	3	3.0
	71-80	38	6.7	47	14.9	19	16.1	14	14.3	14	14.1
	81-100	13	2.8	13	4.1	5	4.2	2	2.0	6	6.1
subtotals		86	15.6	86	27.3	35	29.7	28	28.6	23	23.2
BA/BS	61-70	62	4.6	23	7.3	13	11.0	8	8.2	2	2.0
	71-80	18	3.2	31	9.8	11	9.3	14	14.3	6	6.1
	81-100	2	.3	14	4.4	6	5.1	3	3.1	5	5.1
subtotals		82	8.1	68	21.5	30	25.4	25	25.5	13	13.2
GT BA/BS	61-70	16	2.8	42	13.3	20	16.9	9	9.1	13	13.2
	71-80	13	2.8	59	18.8	14	11.8	12	12.2	33	33.4
	81-100	3	.5	16	5.1	5	4.2	4	4.1	7	7.1
subtotals		32	6.1	117	37.2	39	33.0	25	25.4	53	53.7
totals		571	100.0	315	100.0	118	100.0	98	100.0	99	100.0
total sample N		2422		319		120		99		100	
missing values		65		4		2		1		1	

TABLE 1c. IDEOLOGY

Value Label	By Age	ANES Sample		Study Sample		Study Subsamples					
		(n)	Percent	(n)	Percent	Arl'n		St.Marys		Panthers	
Liberal	61-70	72	14.0	44	14.1	16	13.4	8	8.2	20	20.6
	71-80	50	9.7	87	27.8	24	20.2	15	15.5	48	48.5
	81-100	19	3.7	29	9.3	8	6.7	3	3.1	18	18.6
subtotals		141	27.4	160	51.1	48	40.3	26	26.8	86	87.7
Moderate	61-70	20	3.9	28	8.9	13	10.9	14	14.4	1	1.0
	71-80	25	4.9	36	11.5	18	15.1	13	13.4	5	5.2
	81-100	11	2.1	13	4.2	6	5.0	3	3.1	4	4.1
subtotals		56	10.9	77	24.6	37	31.0	30	30.9	10	10.3
Conserv.	61-70	164	32.0	30	9.6	16	13.4	14	14.3	0	0.0
	71-80	108	21.0	31	9.9	9	7.6	22	22.7	0	0.0
	81-100	44	8.6	15	4.8	9	7.6	5	5.2	1	1.0
subtotals		316	61.6	76	24.3	34	28.6	41	42.2	1	1.0
totals		513	100.0	313	100.0	119	100.0	97	100.0	97	100.0
total sample N		2278		319		120		99		100	
missing values		209		6		1		2		3	

TABLE Id. INCOME

Value Label	By Age	ANES Sample (n) / Percent		Study Sample (n) / Percent		Study Subsamples					
						Arl'n		St.Marys		Panthers	
LT 10000	61-70	57	11.4	5	1.6	0	0.0	4	4.1	1	1.0
	71-80	40	8.0	3	.9	2	1.7	1	1.0	0	0.0
	81-100	27	5.4	4	1.3	2	1.7	1	1.0	1	1.0
subtotals		181	24.8	12	3.8	4	3.3	6	6.1	2	2.0
LT 30000	61-70	111	22.1	27	8.5	14	11.7	6	6.1	7	7.0
	71-80	92	18.3	43	13.5	14	11.7	10	10.2	19	19.0
	81-100	35	7.0	19	6.0	10	8.3	3	3.1	6	6.0
subtotals		238	47.4	89	28.0	38	31.7	19	19.4	32	32.0
LT 50000	61-70	39	7.8	37	11.6	14	11.7	13	13.3	10	10.0
	71-80	27	5.4	62	19.5	16	13.3	18	18.4	28	28.0
	81-100	9	1.8	20	6.3	6	5.0	2	2.0	12	12.0
subtotals		75	15.0	119	37.4	36	30.0	33	33.7	50	50.0
LT 75000	61-70	26	5.2	29	9.1	14	11.7	12	12.2	3	3.0
	71-80	11	2.2	36	11.3	16	13.3	14	14.3	6	6.0
	81-100	5	1.0	8	2.5	3	2.5	3	3.1	2	2.0
subtotals		42	8.4	73	22.9	33	27.5	29	29.6	11	11.0
GT 74999	61-70	18	3.6	7	2.2	4	3.3	3	3.1	0	0.0
	71-80	3	.6	12	3.8	3	2.5	6	6.1	3	3.0
	81-100	2	.4	6	1.9	2	1.7	2	2.0	2	2.0
subtotals		23	4.6	25	7.9	9	7.5	11	11.2	5	5.0
totals		502	100.0	318	100.0	120	100.0	98	100.0	100	100.0
total sample N		2285		319		120		99		100	
missing value		204		1		0		1		0	

TABLE 1e. NOSAY

Value Label	By Age	ANES Sample (n) / Percent		Study Sample (n) / Percent		Study Subsamples				Panthers	
						Arl'n		St. Marys			
Agree	61-70	103	20.1	8	2.5	3	2.5	4	4.0	1	1.0
	71-80	77	15.0	20	6.3	8	6.7	9	9.1	3	3.0
	81-100	37	7.2	22	6.9	7	5.8	8	8.1	7	7.1
subtotals		217	42.3	50	15.7	18	15.0	21	21.2	11	11.1
Agree/ Disagree	61-70	12	2.3	11	3.5	5	4.2	2	2.0	4	4.0
	71-80	11	2.1	23	7.2	10	9.2	6	6.1	6	6.1
	81-100	4	.8	9	2.8	20	1.7	1	1.0	6	6.1
subtotals		27	5.2	43	13.5	18	15.0	9	9.1	16	16.2
Disagree	61-70	136	26.5	86	27.0	38	31.7	32	32.3	16	16.2
	71-80	98	19.1	114	35.8	32	26.7	35	35.4	47	47.5
	81-100	35	6.8	25	7.9	14	11.7	2	2.0	9	9.1
subtotals		269	52.4	225	70.7	84	70.0	69	69.7	72	72.7
totals		513	100.0	318	100.0	120	100.0	99	100.0	99	100.0
total sample N		2234		319		120		99		100	
missing values		253		1		0		0		1	

TABLE 1f. PARTY IDENTIFICATION

Value Label	By Age	ANES Sample (n) / Percent		Study Sample (n) / Percent		Study Subsamples				Panthers	
						Arl'n		St. Marys			
Democrat	61-70	115	20.9	53	17.0	19	16.2	20	21.5	14	14.6
	71-80	92	16.8	90	28.8	27	23.1	19	20.4	44	45.8
	81-100	39	7.1	25	8.0	8	6.8	3	3.2	14	14.6
subtotals		246	44.8	168	53.8	54	46.2	42	45.2	72	75.0
Indep	61-70	83	15.1	15	4.8	6	5.1	5	5.4	4	4.2
	71-80	50	9.1	20	6.4	8	6.8	5	5.4	7	7.3
	81-100	17	3.1	13	4.2	6	5.1	1	1.1	6	6.3
subtotals		150	27.3	48	15.4	20	17.1	11	11.8	17	17.7
Repub	61-70	68	12.4	31	10.0	20	17.1	11	11.8	0	0.0
	71-80	56	10.2	38	12.2	14	12.0	23	24.7	1	1.0
	81-100	29	5.3	16	5.1	9	7.7	6	6.5	1	1.0
subtotals		153	27.9	85	27.3	43	36.8	40	43.0	2	2.1
Socialist	61-70	0	0.0	3	1.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	3.1
	71-80	0	0.0	2	0.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	2.1
	81-100	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
subtotals		0	0.0	5	1.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	5.2
totals		549	100.0	312	100.0	117	100.0	93	100.0	96	100.0
total sample N		2301		319		120		99		100	
missing values		186		7		3		6		4	

TABLE Ig. POLITICAL ACTIVITY SCALE

Value Label	By Age	ANES Sample (n) / Percent		Study Sample (n) / Percent		Study Subsamples				Panthers	
						Arl'n		St.Marys			
None	61-70	37	7.2	6	1.3	0	0.0	2	2.0	2	2.0
	71-80	37	7.2	9	2.8	6	5.0	3	3.0	0	0.0
	81-100	16	3.1	7	2.2	6	5.0	0	0.0	1	1.0
subtotals		90	17.5	60	18.9	37	30.8	22	22.2	1	1.0
Low	61-70	187	36.2	57	17.9	29	24.2	25	25.3	3	3.0
	71-80	134	26.0	64	20.1	27	22.5	32	32.3	5	5.0
	81-100	57	11.0	25	7.8	14	11.7	10	10.1	1	1.0
subtotals		378	73.2	92	29.0	43	35.8	41	41.4	8	8.2
Medium	61-70	23	4.4	37	11.6	16	0.0	10	10.1	11	11.0
	71-80	14	2.7	18	5.6	16	0.0	13	13.1	44	44.0
	81-100	3	.6	73	22.9	3	0.0	1	1.0	14	14.0
subtotals		40	7.7	83	26.2	24	20.0	28	28.3	31	31.6
High	61-70	6	1.2	7	2.2	1	0.8	1	1.0	5	5.0
	71-80	3	.6	11	3.4	2	1.7	2	2.0	7	7.0
	81-100	0	.0	7	2.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	7	7.0
subtotals		9	1.8	82	25.9	16	13.3	8	8.1	58	59.2
totals		517	100.0	317	100.0	120	100.0	99	100.0	98	100.0
total sample N		592		319		120		99		100	
missing values		75		2		0		0		2	

TABLE Ih. RACE

Value Label	By Age	ANES Sample (n) / Percent		Study Sample (n) / Percent		Study Subsamples				Panthers	
						Arl'n		St.Marys			
Caucasian	61-70	250	43.0	103	32.3	44	36.7	38	38.4	21	21.0
	71-80	187	32.2	155	48.6	51	42.7	50	50.5	54	54.0
	81-100	79	13.6	54	16.9	22	18.3	11	11.1	21	21.0
subtotals		516	88.8	312	30.1	117	97.5	99	100.0	96	96.0
African-American	61-70	31	5.3	1	.3	1	.8	0	0.0	0	0.0
	71-80	18	3.1	2	.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	2.0
	81-100	13	2.2	3	.9	1	.8	0	0.0	2	2.0
subtotals		62	10.6	6	1.8	2	1.6	0	0.0	4	4.0
Other	61-70	1	.2	1	.3	1	.8	0	0.0	0	0.0
	71-80	2	.3	0	.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	81-100	0	.0	0	.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
subtotals		3	.5	1	.3	1	.8	0	0.0	0	0.0
totals		581	100.0	319	100.0	120	100.0	99	100.0	100	100.0
total sample N				319		120		99		100	
missing values		35		0		0		0		0	

TABLE Ii. RELIGION

Value Label	By Age	ANES Sample		Study Sample		Study Subsamples					
		(n)	Percent	(n)	Percent	Arl'n	St. Marys		Panthers		
Protestant	61-70	166	31.4	24	10.5	7	10.0	14	21.9	3	3.2
	71-80	134	25.3	47	20.5	15	21.5	20	31.3	12	12.7
	81-100	57	10.8	12	5.2	6	8.5	3	4.7	3	3.2
subtotals		357	67.5	83	36.2	28	40.0	37	57.9	18	19.0
Catholic	61-70	81	15.3	28	12.2	14	20.0	11	17.2	3	3.2
	71-80	53	10.0	13	5.7	6	8.6	6	9.4	1	1.1
	81-100	18	3.4	3	1.3	2	2.9	1	1.6	0	0.0
subtotals		152	28.7	44	19.2	22	31.4	18	28.1	4	4.2
Jewish	61-70	8	1.5	7	3.1	1	1.4	1	1.6	5	5.3
	71-80	7	1.3	4	1.7	1	1.4	1	1.6	8	7.4
	81-100	3	0.6	10	4.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	4.2
subtotals		18	3.4	21	9.2	2	2.8	2	3.1	17	17.9
Unitarian	61-70	0	0.0	7	3.1	3	4.3	0	0.0	4	4.2
	71-80	2	0.4	15	6.6	3	4.3	2	3.1	10	10.5
	81-100	0	0.0	1	.4	1	1.4	0	0.0	0	0.0
subtotals		2	0.4	23	10.1	7	10.0	2	3.1	14	14.7
Other	61-70	0	0.0	1	0.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	1.1
	71-80	0	0.0	1	0.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	1.1
	81-100	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
subtotals		0	0.0	2	0.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	2.2
None	61-70	0	0.0	12	5.2	4	5.7	3	4.7	5	5.3
	71-80	0	0.0	27	11.8	6	8.6	1	1.6	20	21.1
	81-100	0	0.0	17	7.4	1	1.4	1	1.6	15	15.8
subtotals		0	0.0	56	24.4	11	15.7	5	7.8	40	42.1
totals		529	100.0	229	100.0	118	100.0	98	100.0	99	100.0
total sample N		592		319		120		99		100	
missing values		63		4		2		1		1	

TABLE Ij. SEX

Value Label	By Age	ANES Sample		Study Sample		Study Subsamples					
		(n)	Percent	(n)	Percent	Arl'n	St. Marys		Panthers		
Male	61-70	127	21.5	38	11.9	21	17.5	15	15.2	2	2.0
	71-80	68	11.5	43	13.5	11	9.2	20	20.2	12	12.0
	81-100	32	5.4	15	4.7	5	4.2	4	4.0	6	6.0
subtotals		227	38.4	96	30.1	37	30.8	39	39.0	20	20.0
Female	61-70	161	27.2	67	21.0	25	20.8	23	23.2	19	19.0
	71-80	143	24.2	114	35.7	40	33.3	30	30.3	44	44.0
	81-100	61	10.3	42	13.2	18	15.0	7	7.1	17	17.0
subtotals		365	61.5	223	69.9	83	69.1	60	60.6	80	80.0
totals		592	100.0	319	100.0	120	100.0	99	100.0	100	100.0
total sample N		592		319		120		99		100	
missing values		0		0		0		0		0	

Notes: Coding for ANES variables corresponding to study variables.

1. AGE = ANES V3903 (Both recoded: Lo-60=0, 61-70=1, 71-80=2, 80-Hi=3)
2. EDUCATION = ANES V3908 (Recoded: 01-02=0=LT HS, 03=1=HS, 04-05=2=13-15 years, 06=3=College degree, 07=4=Advanced Degree.)
3. INCOME = ANES V4104 Family Income [Recoded: 01-05=1=LT \$10000, 06-15=2=LT \$30000 (and GT \$9999), 16-19=3=LT \$50000, 20-21=4= LT \$75000, and 22-24=5=GT \$74,999.)
4. IDEOLOGY = ANES V3513 (Recoded as 5=1=Conserv, 3=2=Mod, 1=3=Lib)
5. PARTY ID = ANES V3631 (Recoded as 1=1=Repub, 2=2=Indep, 5=3=Democ)
6. ANES Political Activity = V5601+ V5809+ V5810+ V5812+ MONEY+ V6144
 Scale coded: 1-6=1=None, 7,8=2=Low, 9,10=3=Med, 11,12=4=High
 Scale Reliability = Kronbach's alpha = .58
 V5601= Voted in November, Recoded: 5=1=No, 1=2=Yes
 V5809= Wear campaign button, Recoded: 5=1=No, 1=2=Yes
 V5810= Attend pol. mtgs, Recoded: 5=1=No, 1=2=Yes
 V5812= Work for parties, Recoded: 5=1=No, 1=2=Yes
 V6144= Help solve community probs., Recoded: 5=1=No, 1=2=Yes
 MONEY = V5815+ V5817+ V5819 Scale coded: 3=1=No, 4-6=2=Yes
 V5815= Money to candidate, Recoded: 5=1=No, 1=2=Yes
 V5817= Money to party, Recoded: 5=1=No, 1=2=Yes
 V5819= Money to groups, Recoded: 5=1=No, 1=2=Yes

 Study Pol. Activity = MTGS+ WORK+ MONEY+ COMPROB+ CONTACT+ VOTNAT
 Scale coded: 1-6=1=None, 7,8=2=Low, 9,10=3=Med, 11,12=4=High
 Scale Reliability = Kronbach's alpha = .82
 MTGS = ANES V5810, Recoded: 1=No, 2=Yes
 WORK = ANES V5812, Recoded: 1=No, 2=Yes
 MONEY = ANES MONEY questions combined, Recoded: 1=No, 2=Yes
 COMPROB = ANES V6144, Recoded: 1=No, 2=Yes
 CONTACT = ANES "Personally contacted pols.," Recoded: 1=No, 2=Yes
 VOTNAT = ANES "Vote in national elections," Recoded: 1=No, 2=Yes
7. NOSAY = ANES V6102 (Recoded 1,2=1=Agree, 3=2=Agree/Disagree, 4,5=3=Disagree.)
8. RACE = ANES V4202 (Recoded: 1=1=White, 2=2=Black, 3-4=3=Other.)
9. RELIGION = ANES V3850 (Recoded: 010-302,304-309=1=Prot; 400,700-719=2=Catholic; 500-503=3=Jewish; 303=4=Unitarian; 720,790,997=5=Other; 800-995=6=None.)
10. SEX = ANES V4201 (Coded: 1=Male, 2=Female)

SECTION II: TABLE IIa: COUNTY by AGE

		AGE			
Count					
Row	Pct	61-70	71-80	81-Hi	Row
		1	2	3	Total
COUNTY					
	0	46	51	23	120
Arlington		38.3	42.5	19.2	37.6
	1	38	50	11	99
St Marys		38.4	50.5	11.1	31.0
	2	21	56	23	100
Panthers		21.0	56.0	23.0	31.3
	Column	105	157	57	319
	Total	32.9	49.2	17.9	100.0

TABLE IIb: COUNTY by POLITICALLY ACTIVE FRIENDS

		BUDSPA			
Count					
Row	Pct	none	few	many	Row
		0	1	2	Total
COUNTY					
	0	37	68	15	120
Arlington		30.8	56.7	12.5	37.7
	1	30	58	10	98
St Marys		30.6	59.2	10.2	30.8
	2	6	34	60	100
Panthers		6.0	34.0	60.0	31.4
	Column	73	160	85	318
	Total	23.0	50.3	26.7	100.0

TABLE IIc: COUNTY by CIVIC DUTY

		CDUTY4			
Count					
Row	Pct	none/low	medium	high	Row
		1	2	3	Total
COUNTY					
	0	5	48	67	120
Arlington		4.2	40.0	55.8	37.6
	1	5	56	38	99
St Marys		5.1	56.6	38.4	31.0
	2	1	20	79	100
Panthers		1.0	20.0	79.0	31.3
Column		11	124	184	319
Total		3.4	38.9	57.7	100.0

TABLE IId: COUNTY by INCOME

		INCOME				
Count						
Row	Pct	LT 30000	LT 50000	LT 75001	GT 75000	Row
		1	2	3	4	Total
COUNTY						
	0	42	36	33	9	120
Arlington		35.0	30.0	27.5	7.5	37.7
	1	25	33	29	11	98
St Marys		25.5	33.7	29.6	11.2	30.8
	2	34	50	11	5	100
Panthers		34.0	50.0	11.0	5.0	31.4
Column		101	119	73	25	318
Total		31.8	37.4	23.0	7.9	100.0

TABLE IIe: COUNTY by LIVE NOW

		LVNOW					
Count							
Row	Pct	rural	sm town	lg town	suburban	urban	Row
		0	1	2	3	4	Total
COUNTY							
	0		3	6	88	23	120
Arlington			2.5	5.0	73.3	19.2	37.6
	1	4	76	3	8	8	99
St Marys		4.0	76.8	3.0	8.1	8.1	31.0
	2		19	3	62	16	100
Panthers			19.0	3.0	62.0	16.0	31.3
Column		4	98	12	158	47	319
Total		1.3	30.7	3.8	49.5	14.7	100.0

TABLE IIIf: COUNTY by POLITICAL ATTENTION AFTER 60

		POLATN2A			
Count					
Row	Pct	none/low	medium	high	Row
		1	2	3	Total
COUNTY					
	0	15	55	50	120
Arlington		12.5	45.8	41.7	37.6
	1	18	48	33	99
St Marys		18.2	48.5	33.3	31.0
	2	8	44	48	100
Panthers		8.0	44.0	48.0	31.3
Column		41	147	131	319
Total		12.9	46.1	41.1	100.0

TABLE IIg: COUNTY by POLITICAL INTEREST AFTER 60

POLINT2A						
COUNTY	Count					
	Row	Pct	low	med	high	Row
				1	2	3 Total
	0		6	17	97	120
Arlington			5.0	14.2	80.8	37.9
	1		2	11	86	99
St Marys			2.0	11.1	86.9	31.2
	2			3	95	98
Panthers				3.1	96.9	30.9
	Column		8	31	278	317
	Total		2.5	9.8	87.7	100.0

TABLE IIh: COUNTY by POLITICALLY ACTIVE SPOUSE

SPOUSEPA					
COUNTY	Count	no	yes	not appl icable	Row Total
	Row Pct				
		0	1	9	
	0	56	14	50	120
Arlington		46.7	11.7	41.7	37.6
	1	59	22	18	99
St Marys		59.6	22.2	18.2	31.0
	2	21	28	51	100
Panthers		21.0	28.0	51.0	31.3
	Column	136	64	119	319
	Total	42.6	20.1	37.3	100.0

TABLE IIIi: COUNTY by VOTING ACTIVITY BEFORE 60

VOTE1A					
COUNTY	Count			Row Total	
	Row	Pct	none/low medium high		
			123		
	0	2	45	73	120
Arlington		1.7	37.5	60.8	37.6
	1	5	40	54	99
St Marys		5.1	40.4	54.5	31.0
	2		6	94	100
Panthers			6.0	94.0	31.3
	Column	7	91	221	319
	Total	2.2	28.5	69.3	100.0

TABLE IIj: COUNTY by VOTING ACTIVITY AFTER 60

VOTE2A					
Count					
Row	Pct	none/low med	high		Row
		1	2	3	Total
COUNTY					
	0	2	41	77	120
Arlington		1.7	34.2	64.2	37.6
	1	2	37	60	99
St Marys		2.0	37.4	60.6	31.0
	2	2	7	91	100
Panthers		2.0	7.0	91.0	31.3
Column		6	85	228	319
Total		1.9	26.6	71.5	100.0

SECTION III

TABLE IIIa: POL. ACTIVITY AFTER 60 by POLITICALLY ACTIVE FRIENDS

BUDSPA					
Count					Row Total
Row	Pct	none	few	many	
		0	1	2	
POLACT2A					
	0	9	11		20
none		45.0	55.0		6.3
	1	43	64	8	115
low		37.4	55.7	7.0	36.2
	2	13	57	17	87
med		14.9	65.5	19.5	27.4
	3	8	28	60	96
high		8.3	29.2	62.5	30.2
Column		73	160	85	318
Total		23.0	50.3	26.7	100.0

TABLE IIIb: POL. ACTIVITY AFTER 60 BY MOTHER'S POLITICAL ACTIVITY

		MPOLACT4			
Count					
Row	Pct	none	low	med/high	Row
		0	1	2	Total
POLACT2A					
	0	7	1		8
none		87.5	12.5		3.6
	1	48	18	1	67
low		71.6	26.9	1.5	30.5
	2	39	17	6	62
med		62.9	27.4	9.7	28.2
	3	35	37	11	83
high		42.2	44.6	13.3	37.7
Column		129	73	18	220
Total		58.6	33.2	8.2	100.0

TABLE IIIc: POL. ACTIVITY AFTER 60 by POL. ATTENTION AFTER 60

		POLATN2A				
Count						
Row	Pct	none/low	medium	high		Row
		1	2	3		Total
<hr/>						
POLACT2A	0	11	5	4		20
none		55.0	25.0	20.0		6.3
<hr/>						
	1	18	63	35		116
low		15.5	54.3	30.2		36.4
<hr/>						
	2	10	46	31		87
med		11.5	52.9	35.6		27.3
<hr/>						
	3	2	33	61		96
high		2.1	34.4	63.5		30.1
<hr/>						
Column		41	147	131		319
Total		12.9	46.1	41.1		100.0

TABLE IIIId: POL. ACTIVITY AFTER 60 by AREA RAISED

		PSLIVE					
Count							
Row	Pct	rural	sm town	lg town	suburban	urban	Row
		0	1	2	3	4	Total
POLACT2A							
	0	3	2	4	4	7	20
none		15.0	10.0	20.0	20.0	35.0	6.3
	1	17	44	18	12	24	115
low		14.8	38.3	15.7	10.4	20.9	36.2
	2	11	35	7	4	30	87
med		12.6	40.2	8.0	4.6	34.5	27.4
	3	7	18	10	8	53	96
high		7.3	18.8	10.4	8.3	55.2	30.2
Column		38	99	39	28	114	318
Total		11.9	31.1	12.3	8.8	35.8	100.0

TABLE IIIIe: POL. ACTIVITY AFTER 60 by VOTING BEFORE 60

		VOTE1A			
Count					
Row	Pct	none/low	medium	high	Row
		1	2	3	Total
POLACT2A					
	0	3	11	6	20
none		15.0	55.0	30.0	6.3
	1	1	43	72	116
low		.9	37.1	62.1	36.4
	2	2	29	56	87
med		2.3	33.3	64.4	27.3
	3	1	8	87	96
high		1.0	8.3	90.6	30.1
Column		7	91	221	319
Total		2.2	28.5	69.3	100.0

TABLE IIII: POL. ACTIVITY AFTER 60 by VOTING AFTER 60

		VOTE2A			
Count					
Row	Pct	none/low med	high		Row
		1	2	3	Total
POLACT2A					
	0	3	13	4	20
none		15.0	65.0	20.0	6.3
	1	3	40	73	116
low		2.6	34.5	62.9	36.4
	2		23	64	87
med			26.4	73.6	27.3
	3		9	87	96
high			9.4	90.6	30.1
Column		6	85	228	319
Total		1.9	26.6	71.5	100.0

SECTION IV

TABLE IVa: POL. ATTENTION AFTER 60 by CIVIC DUTY

		CDUTY4			
Count					
Row	Pct	none/low	medium	high	Row
		1	2	3	Total
POLATN2A					
	0			2	2
none				100.0	.6
	1	4	24	11	39
low		10.3	61.5	28.2	12.2
	2	4	60	83	147
med		2.7	40.8	56.5	46.1
	3	3	40	88	131
high		2.3	30.5	67.2	41.1
Column		11	124	184	319
Total		3.4	38.9	57.7	100.0

TABLE IVb: POL. ATTENTION AFTER 60 by GROUP INVOLVEMENT

		GROUP3			
Count					
Row	Pct	low	med	high	Row
		1	2	3	Total
POLATN2A					
	1	14	12	15	41
none/low		34.1	29.3	36.6	12.9
	2	27	41	79	147
medium		18.4	27.9	53.7	46.1
	3	15	32	84	131
high		11.5	24.4	64.1	41.1
Column		56	85	178	319
Total		17.6	26.6	55.8	100.0

TABLE IVc: POL. ATTENTION AFTER 60 by HEALTH

		HEALTH			
	Count				
Row	Pct	poor/fair	good	excellent	Row
		1	2	3	Total
POLATN2A					
	1	3	24	14	41
none/low		7.3	58.5	34.1	12.9
	2	26	76	44	146
medium		17.8	52.1	30.1	45.9
	3	19	85	27	131
high		14.5	64.9	20.6	41.2
	Column	48	185	85	318
	Total	15.1	58.2	26.7	100.0

TABLE IVd: POL. ATTENTION AFTER 60 by LIVE NOW

		LVNOW				
Count Row Pct		rural/ST	Lg Town	Suburban	Urban	Row Total
		1	2	3	4	Total
POLATN2A						
	1	15		19	7	41
none/low		36.6		46.3	17.1	12.9
	2	55	4	67	21	147
medium		37.4	2.7	45.6	14.3	46.1
	3	32	8	72	19	131
high		24.4	6.1	55.0	14.5	41.1
Column		102	12	158	47	319
Total		32.0	3.8	49.5	14.7	100.0

TABLE IVe: POL. ATTENTION AFTER 60 by MOTHER'S POLITICAL ACTIVITY

		MPOLACT4			
Count					
Row	Pct	none	low	med/high	Row
					Total
		0	1	2	
POLATN2A					
	1	20	3		23
none/low		87.0	13.0		10.5
	2	58	27	8	93
medium		62.4	29.0	8.6	42.3
	3	51	43	10	104
high		49.0	41.3	9.6	47.3
	Column	129	73	18	220
	Total	58.6	33.2	8.2	100.0

TABLE IVf: POL. ATTENTION AFTER 60 by POLITICAL COMMUNICATION

		POLCOMM3				
Count						
Row	Pct	none	low	med	high	Row
		0	1	2	3	Total
POLATN2A						
	1	6	8	6		20
none/low		30.0	40.0	30.0		9.8
	2	9	37	37	6	89
medium		10.1	41.6	41.6	6.7	43.4
	3	7	47	34	8	96
high		7.3	49.0	35.4	8.3	46.8
	Column	22	92	77	14	205
	Total	10.7	44.9	37.6	6.8	100.0

TABLE IVg: POL. ATTENTION AFTER 60 by POLITICAL INTEREST BEFORE 60

		POLINT1A			
Count					
Row	Pct	low	med	high	Row
		1	2	3	Total
POLATN2A					
	1	9	12	19	40
none/low		22.5	30.0	47.5	12.6
	2	14	14	119	147
medium		9.5	9.5	81.0	46.2
	3	2	11	118	131
high		1.5	8.4	90.1	41.2
Column		25	37	256	318
Total		7.9	11.6	80.5	100.0

TABLE IVh: POL. ATTENTION AFTER 60 by POLITICAL INTEREST AFTER 60

		POLINT2A			Row Total
		low	med	high	
		1	2	3	
POLATN2A					
	1	3	11	25	39
low		7.7	28.2	64.1	12.3
	2	3	13	131	147
med		2.0	8.8	89.1	46.4
	3	2	7	122	131
high		1.5	5.3	93.1	41.3
	Column	8	31	278	317
	Total	2.5	9.8	87.7	100.0

TABLE IVi: POL. ATTENTION AFTER 60 by AREA RAISED

		PSLIVE					Row Total
		rural	sm town	lg town	suburban	urban	
		0	1	2	3	4	
POLATN2A							
	1	7	14	6	2	12	41
none/low		17.1	34.1	14.6	4.9	29.3	12.9
	2	23	49	21	11	42	146
medium		15.8	33.6	14.4	7.5	28.8	45.9
	3	8	36	12	15	60	131
high		6.1	27.5	9.2	11.5	45.8	41.2
	Column	38	99	39	28	114	318
	Total	11.9	31.1	12.3	8.8	35.8	100.0

SECTION V: TABLE Va: VOTING AFTER 60 by POLITICALLY ACTIVE FRIENDS

		BUDSPA			Row Total
		none	few	many	
		0	1	2	
VOTE2A					
	1	2	4		6
none/low		33.3	66.7		1.9
	2	38	35	12	85
med		44.7	41.2	14.1	26.7
	3	33	121	73	227
high		14.5	53.3	32.2	71.4
	Column	73	160	85	318
	Total	23.0	50.3	26.7	100.0

TABLE Vb: VOTING AFTER SIXTY by EDUCATION

		EDUC3			
		Count			
	Row	Pct	HS	College	Post-Grad
			1	2	3
VOTE2A					Row
					Total
	1	3	3		6
none/low		50.0	50.0		1.9
	2	11	47	27	85
med		12.9	55.3	31.8	26.6
	3	30	104	94	228
high		13.2	45.6	41.2	71.5
	Column	44	154	121	319
	Total	13.8	48.3	37.9	100.0

TABLE Vc: VOTING AFTER 60 by EXPRESSING OPINIONS

		EXPRESS			
		Count			
	Row	Pct	never	rarely	sometime often
					s
			1	2	3
VOTE2A					4
					Total
	1	3			3
none/low		100.0			1.4
	2	16	6	5	27
med		59.3	22.2	18.5	12.9
	3	78	30	54	17
high		43.6	16.8	30.2	9.5
	Column	97	36	59	17
	Total	46.4	17.2	28.2	8.1
					209
					100.0

TABLE Vd: VOTING AFTER 60 by GROUP INVOLVEMENT

		GROUP3		
		Count		
	Row	Pct	low	med
				high
			1	2
VOTE2A				3
				Row
				Total
	1	3	2	1
none/low		50.0	33.3	16.7
	2	26	22	37
med		30.6	25.9	43.5
	3	27	61	140
high		11.8	26.8	61.4
	Column	56	85	178
	Total	17.6	26.6	55.8
				319
				100.0

TABLE Vc: VOTING AFTER 60 by YEARS IN THE COMMUNITY

		LVYRS			Row Total
		Count			
VOTE2A	Row Pct	lt 5	5-10	gt 10	
		0	2	3	
none/low	1	3		3	6
		50.0		50.0	1.9
med	2	5	9	71	85
		5.9	10.6	83.5	26.6
high	3	7	19	202	228
		3.1	8.3	88.6	71.5
Column		15	28	276	319
Total		4.7	8.8	86.5	100.0

TABLE Vd: VOTING AFTER 60 by MOTHER'S POLITICAL ACTIVITY

		MPOLACT4			Row Total
		Count			
VOTE2A	Row Pct	none	low	med/high	
		0	1	2	
none	0	3			3
		100.0			1.4
med	2	21	5	1	27
		77.8	18.5	3.7	12.3
high	3	105	68	17	190
		55.3	35.8	8.9	86.4
Column		129	73	18	220
Total		58.6	33.2	8.2	100.0

TABLE Vg: VOTING AFTER 60 by POL. ACTIVITY BEFORE 60

		POLACT1A				Row Total
		Count				
VOTE2A	Row Pct	none	low	med	high	
		0	1	2	3	
none/low	1	1	2	1	2	6
		16.7	33.3	16.7	33.3	1.9
med	2	13	41	19	12	85
		15.3	48.2	22.4	14.1	26.6
high	3	1	73	57	97	228
		.4	32.0	25.0	42.5	71.5
Column		15	116	77	111	319
Total		4.7	36.4	24.1	34.8	100.0

TABLE Vh: VOTING AFTER 60 by POL. ACTIVITY AFTER 60

		POLACT2A				
Count						
Row	Pct	none	low	med	high	Row
		0	1	2	3	Total
VOTE2A						
	1	3	3			6
none/low		50.0	50.0			1.9
	2	13	40	23	9	85
med		15.3	47.1	27.1	10.6	26.6
	3	4	73	64	87	228
high		1.8	32.0	28.1	38.2	71.5
Column		20	116	87	96	319
Total		6.3	36.4	27.3	30.1	100.0

TABLE Vi: VOTING AFTER 60 by FATHER'S POWER

		POWERDA3				
Count						
Row	Pct	low	med	high	Row	
			1	2	3	Total
VOTE2A						
	1	4				4
none/low		100.0				1.9
	2	1	15	13		29
med		3.4	51.7	44.8		13.5
	3	11	91	80		182
high		6.0	50.0	44.0		84.7
	Column	16	106	93		215
	Total	7.4	49.3	43.3		100.0

TABLE Vj: VOTING AFTER 60 by AREA RAISED

		PSLIVE					Row Total
		Count Row Pct	rural	sm town	lg town	suburban urban	
			0	1	2	3	4
VOTE2A							
	1		1	2	1		2
none/low			16.7	33.3	16.7		33.3
	2		14	31	14	5	21
med			16.5	36.5	16.5	5.9	24.7
	3		23	66	24	23	91
high			10.1	29.1	10.6	10.1	40.1
Column			38	99	39	28	114
Total			11.9	31.1	12.3	8.8	35.8
							318
							100.0

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abramson, P., J. Aldrich and D. Rohde. Change and Continuity in the 1988 Elections. Washington DC: Congressional Quarterly, 1990.
- Adorno, T.W., E. Frenkel-Brunswick, D. Levinson, and R.N. Sanford. The Authoritarian Personality. New York: Harper and Row, 1950.
- Almond, Gabriel and Sidney Verba. The Civic Culture. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1965.
- Alwin, Duane F., Ronald L. Cohen and Theodore M. Newcomb. Political Attitudes Over the Life Span: The Bennington Women After 50 Years. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1991.
- Andrews, Molly. Lifetimes of Commitment: Aging, Politics and Psychology. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- Ansolabehere, S. et al. The Media Game. New York: Macmillan, 1993.
- Atchley, R.C. Social Forces and Aging. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, 1988.
- Atchley, R.C. The Sociology of Retirement. Cambridge, MA: Schenkman, 1976.
- Atchley, R.C. The Social Forces in Later Life. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, 1972.
- Atchley, R.C. "Retirement and Leisure Participation: Continuity or Crisis?" The Gerontologist 11 (1971): 13-17.
- Atkin, C.K. "Communication and Political Socialization." In The Handbook of Political Communication, pp 299-328. Edited by D. Nimmo and K. Sanders. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, 1981.
- Babbie, E. The Practice of Social Research. 4th ed. New York: Wadsworth, 1986.
- Babchuck, N. and A. Booth. "Voluntary Association Membership: A Longitudinal Analysis," American Sociological Review 34 (1969): 31-45.
- Baltes, P.B. and H.W. Reese. "The Life-Span Perspective in Developmental Psychology." In Developmental Psychology. Edited by M. Bornstein and M. Lamb. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 1984.
- Baltes, P.B. and K.W. Schaie, eds. Lifespan Psychology: Personality and Socialization. New York: Academic Press, 1973.

- Baradat, Leon P. Political Ideologies. 2nd ed. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1984.
- Barfield, Richard E. and James Morgan. "Trends in Planned Early Retirement." The Gerontologist 18 (1978): 13-18.
- Barfield, Richard E. and James Morgan. Early Retirement: The Decision and the Experience. Ann Arbor: Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, 1969.
- Barrow, G.M., and P.A. Smith. Aging, Ageism and Society. St Paul, MN: West Publishing, 1979.
- Bar-Tal, D., A. Raviv, and T. Leiser. "The Development of Altruistic Behavior: Empirical Evidence." Developmental Psychology 16 (1980): 516-524.
- Baumrind, D. "Current Patterns of Parental Authority." Developmental Psychology Monographs 1 (1971): 1-103.
- Becker, Howard. "Personal Change in Adult Life." In Middle Age and Aging: A Reader in Social Psychology, pp 148-156. Edited by Bernice L. Neugarten. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968.
- Bennett, Stephen E. Apathy in America: 1960-1984. Dobbs Ferry, NY: Transnational Publishers, 1986.
- Berelson, B., P. Lazarsfeld, and W. McPhee. Voting. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1954.
- Binstock, R. "Aging and the Future of American Politics." The Annals. 415 (1974): 199-212.
- Binstock, R. "Interest Group Liberalism and the Politics of Aging," Gerontologist 12 (1972): 265-280.
- Binstock, R. and E. Shanas, eds. Handbook of Aging and the Social Sciences. 2nd ed. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1985.
- Birren, J.E. and K.W. Schaie, eds. Handbook of the Psychology of Aging. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1977.
- Blau, P.M. Exchange and Power in Social Life. New York: Wiley, 1964.
- Bogart, Leo. Press and Public. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Assocs., 1981.
- Bookstein, F.L. and W.A. Achenbaum. "Aging as Explanation: How Scientific Measurement Can Advance Critical Gerontology." In Voices and Visions of Aging, pp 20-39. Edited by T. Cole et al. New York: Springer Publishing, 1993.

Boyd, Richard W. and Herbert Hyman. "Survey Research," in Handbook of Political Science. Vol 7, Strategies of Inquiry. Edited by Fred Greenstein and Nelson Polsby. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1975.

Brady, H.E., S. Verba, and K.L. Schlozman. "Beyond SES: A Resource Model of Political Participation." American Political Science Review 89 2 (June 1995): 271-294.

Brim, O.G., Jr. and J. Kagan, eds. Constancy and Change in Human Development. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1980.

Brim, O.G. and S.W. Wheeler. Socialization After Childhood: Two Essays. New York: Wiley, 1966.

Brody, Richard. "The Puzzle of Political Participation." In The New American Political System, pp 287-324. Edited by A. King. Washington D.C.: American Enterprise Institute, 1978.

Bronfenbrenner, U. Two Worlds of Childhood. New York: Russell Sage, 1970.

Bromley, D. B. The Psychology of Human Aging. Harmondsworth, U.K.: Penguin, 1966.

Browne, William P. and Laura Katz Olson, eds. Aging and Public Policy: The Politics of Growing Old in America. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1983.

Butler, R. Why Survive: Being Old in America. New York: Harper and Row, 1975.

Button, J. and Walter Rosenbaum. "Seeing Gray: School Bond Issues and the Aging in Florida." Research on Aging 11 2 (1989): 158-173.

Button, J. and Walter Rosenbaum. "Gray Power, Gray Peril or Gray Myth?" Social Science Quarterly 71 1 (1990): 25-38.

Cameron, S. "The Politics of the Elderly." Midwest Quarterly 15 2 (1974): 141-153.

Campbell, A. "Politics Through the Life Cycle." Gerontologist 11 (1971): 112-117.

Campbell, Angus, Philip E. Converse, Warren E. Miller, and Donald E. Stokes. The American Voter. New York: Wiley, 1960.

Carroll, Susan J. "The Socializing Impact of the Women's Movement." Political Learning in Adulthood, pp 306-339. Edited by Roberta Sigel. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989.

Chaffee, S., J. McLeod and D. Wackman. "Family Communication Patterns and Adolescent Political Participation." In Socialization to Politics, pp 349-390. Edited by Jack Dennis. New York: Wiley, 1973.

- Chaffee, S., S. Ward, and L. Tipton. "Mass Communication and Political Socialization." In Handbook of Political Socialization. Edited by S. Renshon. New York: Free Press, 1970.
- Chambre, Susan. "Is Volunteering a Substitute for Role Loss in Old Age? An Empirical Test of Activity Theory." The Gerontologist 24 3 (Jun 1984): 292-298.
- Christy, C. Sex Differences in Political Participation. New York: Praeger, 1987.
- Citrin, Jack. "Comment: The Political Relevance of Trust in Government." American Political Science Review 68 (Sep 1974): 973-988.
- Clark, P.B. and James Q. Wilson. "Incentive Systems: A Theory of Organizations." Administrative Science Quarterly 6 (1961): 219-266.
- Clausen, J.A. Socialization and Society. Boston: Little-Brown, 1968.
- Cohler. "Personal Narrative and the Life Course." In Life Span Development and Behavior, Vol 4. Edited by P.B Baltes and O.G. Brim Jr. New York: Academic Press, 1982.
- Coleman, P.G. Ageing and Reminiscence Processes. Chicester: Wiley, 1986.
- Comstock, G. et al. Television and Human Behavior. New York: Columbia University Press, 1978.
- Converse, P. Dynamics of Party Support. Beverly Hills: Sage, 1976.
- Converse, Philip E. "Change in the American Electorate." In The Human Meaning of Social Change by A. Campbell and P. Converse. New York: Russell Sage, 1972.
- Converse, Philip E. "The Nature of Belief Systems in Mass Publics." In Ideology and Discontent, pp. 206-261. Edited by David E. Apter. New York: Free Press, 1964.
- Conway, M.M. Political Participation in the United States. 2nd ed. Washington DC: Congressional Quarterly Press, 1991.
- Cook, Timothy E. "The Bear Market in Political Socialization and the Cost of Misunderstood Psychological Theories." American Political Science Review 79 (1985): 1079-1093.
- Cox, Grace, E. Freeman, and L. Katz. Making a Difference: Lifelong Political Activists. Oakland, CA: Jed Eye Video and Marin Psychologists for Social Responsibility, 1993.
- Crovitz, H.F., and K. Quina-Holland. "Proportion of Episodic Memories from Early Childhood by Years of Age." Bulletin of Psychonomic Study 7 (1976): 61-62.

- Cumming, E. and W E Henry. Growing Old the Process of Disengagement. New York: Basic Books, 1961.
- Cutler, N.E. "Age and Political Behavior," In Aging: Scientific Perspectives and Social Issues, 409-441. 2nd ed. Edited by Diana Woodruff and J.E. Birren. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole, 1983.
- Cutler, N.E. "Voluntary Association Participation and Life Satisfaction: Replication, Revision and Extension." International Journal of Aging and Human Development 14 (1982): 127-37.
- Cutler, N.E. "Political Characteristics of Elderly Cohorts in the 21st Century." In Aging: Social Change, pp 127-57. Edited by Sara Kiesler et al. New York: Academic Press, 1981.
- Cutler, N.E. "Toward and Age-Appropriate Typology for the Study of Participation of Older Persons in Voluntary Associations." Journal of Voluntary Action Research 9 (1981): 9-19.
- Cutler, N.E. "Aging and Voluntary Association Participation," Journal of Gerontology 32 (1977): 470-479.
- Cutler, N.E. "Socioeconomic Predictors of Subjective Age." Paper presented at the 28th Annual Meeting of the Gerontological Society, Louisville Ky, 1975.
- Cutler, N.E. "Perceived Prestige Loss and Political Attitudes Among the Aged." Gerontologist 14 (Spring 1973): 68-75.
- Cutler, N.E. "Generation, Maturation, and Party Affiliation: A Cohort Analysis," Public Opinion Quarterly 33 (1969): 583-88.
- Cutler, N.E. et al. "Age and Politics: How Golden is the Future?" Generations 9 (1984): 38-43.
- Cutler, N.E. and G.E. Minns. "Political Resources of the Elderly: The Impact of Membership in Nonpolitical Voluntary Associations upon Political Activity." Paper presented at Annual Meeting of APSA, Washington D.C., 1977.
- Dahl, Robert. "Political Man." In Modern Political Analysis, pp 55-71. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1963.
- Dalton, Russell. Citizen Politics in Western Democracies. Chatham, NJ: Chatham House, 1988.
- Davies, J.C. "The Family's Role in Socialization." Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science. 361 (1965): 10-19.
- Dawson, R.E., K. Prewitt, and K. Dawson. Political Socialization. 2nd ed. Boston: Little, Brown, 1977.
- Day, C. What Older Americans Think: Interest Groups and Aging Policy. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990.

- De Beauvoir, Simone. Old Age. Harmondsworth UK: Penguin, 1970.
- Delli Carpini, Michael. Stability and Change in American Politics, The Coming of Age of the Generation of the 1960s. New York: NYU Press, 1986.
- Dennis, Jack. Socialization to Politics. New York: Wiley, 1973.
- DePalma, D.J. "Effects of Social Classes, Moral Orientation, and Severity of Punishment of Boy's Moral Responses to Transgression and Generosity." Developmental Psychology 10 (1974): 890-900.
- DeWaele, J.P. and R. Harre. "Autobiography as a Psychological Method," in Emerging Strategies in Social Psychological Research. Chichester: Wiley, 1979.
- DiPalma, G. Apathy and Participation. New York: Free Press, 1970.
- Dobson, Douglas. "Elderly as a Political Force." In Aging and Public Policy, 151-168. Edited by W. Brown and L. Olson. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1983.
- Dowd, J.J. "Aging and Exchange: A Preface to Theory." In The Age of Aging, pp 98-118. Edited by A. Monk. Buffalo, NY: Prometheus, 1979.
- Easton, David and J. Dennis. Children in the Political System. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1969.
- Edinger, Lewis J. Politics of the Aged: Orientations and Behavior in Major Liberal Democracies. New York: Columbia University Press, 1982.
- Eisenberg, N. and P. Mussen. The Roots of Prosocial Behavior in Children. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- Elder, G. Life Course Dynamics. Ithaca: Cornell Press, 1985.
- Elder, Glen H., Jr. Children of the Great Depression. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974.
- Erbe, W. "Social Involvement in Political Activity." American Sociological Review 29 (1964): 198-215.
- Erikson, Robert S., Norman R. Luttberg, and Carol L. Tedin. American Public Opinion. 4th ed. New York: MacMillan, 1991.
- Feshbach, N. "The Relationship of Child Rearing Factors to Children's Aggression, Empathy, and Relative Positive and Negative Social Behaviors." Paper presented at Conference on Determinants and Origins of Aggressive Behavior, Monte Carlo, Monaco, 1973.

- Fitzgerald, J.M. and R. Lawrence. "Autobiographical Memories Across the Lifespan." Journal of Gerontology 39 (1984): 207-216.
- Flanigan, William H. and Nancy Zingale. Political Behavior of the American Electorate. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1975.
- Foner, A. Aging and Old Age. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1986.
- Foner, A. and K. Schwab. "Work and Retirement in a Changing Society." In Aging and Society. Edited by M.W. Riley and K. Bond. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1983.
- Foster, Phyllis. Activities of the "Well-Elderly". New York: Haworth Press, 1983.
- Fox, Judith H. "Perspectives on the Continuity Perspective." International Aging and Human Development 14 2 (1981-82): 97-115.
- Friedrich, James M. and Kenneth Levoy. "Back to the Future: Adult Political Behavior of Former Student Activists." American Sociological Review 53 (1988): 780-84.
- Gant, Michael M. and Norman R. Luttbeg. American Electoral Behavior. Itasca, IL: Peacock, 1991.
- George, L.K. Role Transitions in Later Life. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole, 1980.
- Gilbert, J.G. Understanding Old Age. New York: Ronald Press, 1952.
- Gittins, Diana. "Oral History, Reliability and Recollection." In The Recall Method in Social Surveys. Edited by L. Moss and H. Goldstein. London: University of London Institute, 1979.
- Glenn, N.D. "Aging, Disengagement, and Opinionation," Public Opinion Quarterly 33 (1969): 17-33.
- Glenn, N.D. and M. Grimes. "Aging, Voting and Political Interest." American Sociological Review 33 (1968): 563-75.
- Goslin, D.A., ed. Handbook of Socialization Theory and Research. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1969.
- Graney, M. "Happiness and Social Participation in Aging," Journal of Gerontology 30 (1975): 701-706.
- Greenstein, F.I. Personality and Politics. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1987.
- Greenstein, F.I. Children and Politics. 2nd ed. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1974.

Greenstein, F.I. "Political Socialization." In International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, Vol 14, pp 551-555. Edited by D. Sills. New York: MacMillan, 1968.

Greenstein, F.I. "The Benevolent Leader: Children's Image of Political Authority," American Political Science Review 54 (1960): 934-45.

Gross, Ronald, Beatrice Gross and Sylvia Seidman, eds. The New Old. Garden City, NY: Anchor Books, 1978.

Hausknecht, M. The Joiners. New York: Bedminster Press, 1962.

Havighurst, Robert J., Bernice Neugarten and Sheldon Tobin, "Disengagement and Patterns of Aging." In Middle Age and Aging, pp 161-172. Edited by B. Neugarten. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968.

Hazan, Haim. "Discontinuity and Identity: A Case Study of Social Reintegration Among the Aged." Research On Aging 5 4 (Dec 1983): 473-489.

Heintz, K.M. "Retirement Communities: For Adults Only." New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers Center for Urban Policy Research, 1976.

Hess, Robert D. and David Easton. "The Role of the Elementary School." The School Review 70 (1962): 257-265.

Hess, B.B. and E. Markson, eds. Growing Old in America, 4th ed. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books, 1991.

Hess, Robert D. and Judith Torney. The Development of Political Attitudes in Children. Chicago: Aldine, 1967.

Hess, Robert D. and Judith Torney. The Development of Basic Attitudes and Values Toward Government and Citizenship During Elementary School Years. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965.

Hewitt, P. and Neil Howe. "Generational Equity and the Future of Generational Politics," Generations 12 3 (Spq 1988): 10-13.

Hinde, R.A. and Jo Groebel, eds. Cooperation and Prosocial Behavior. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Hinde, R.A. and J. Stevenson-Hinde. Relationships Within Families. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988.

Hodge, R.W. and D.J. Tremain. "Social Participation and Social Status." American Sociological Review 33 (1968): 722-740.

- Hoffman, M.L. "Conscience, Personality and Socialization Techniques." Human Development 13 (1970): 90-126.
- Hoffman, M.L. and H.D. Saltzstein. "Parent Discipline and the Child's Moral Development." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 5 (1967): 45-57.
- Holtzman, A. "Analysis of Old Age Behavior in the U.S." The Gerontologist 9 (1954): 56-66.
- Hubbard, P. et al. "Seniors for Justice: A Political and Social Action Group For Nursing Home Residents." Gerontologist 32 6 (Dec 1992): 856-858.
- Hudson, Robert B. "Tomorrow's Able Elders: Implications For the State." Gerontologist 27 4 (Aug 1987): 405-409.
- Hudson, Robert B. "Emerging Pressures on Public Policies for the Aging." Society 15 (July/Aug 1978): 30-33.
- Hudson, Robert B. and John M. Strate. "Aging and Political Systems." In Handbook of Aging and the Social Sciences, pp 554-585. 2nd ed. Edited by Binstock and Shanas. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1985.
- Hudson, Robert B. and Robert H. Binstock. "Political Systems and Aging." In Handbook of Aging and the Social Sciences, pp 369-400. Edited by Binstock and Shanas. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1976.
- Hyman, H. Political Socialization. Glencoe: The Free Press, 1959.
- Inglehart, R. Culture Shift in Advanced Industrial Society. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1990.
- Inkeles, A. "Social Structure and Socialization." In Handbook of Socialization Theory and Research, pp 615-32. Edited by Goslin. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1969.
- Ishii-Kuntz, M. "Formal Activities for Elderly Women." Journal of Women and Aging 2 1 (1990): 79-97.
- Itzin, Catherine. "Media Images of Women: The Social Construction of Ageism and Sexism." In Feminist Social Psychology. Edited by S. Wilkinson. Milton Keynes: Open University Press, 1986.
- Itzin, F.H. "Social Relationships and Activities," In Hoffman's Daily Needs and Interests of Older People, pp 95-118. Edited by Woodrow Morris. Springfield, IL: C.C. Thomas, 1983.
- Jackson, D. "Advanced Aged Adults' Reflections of Middle Age," The Gerontologist 14 (1974): 255-257.
- Jankowski, T.B. and J.M. Strate. "Modes of Participation Over the Adult Lifespan." Political Behavior 17 (1995): 89-106.

- Janowitz, M. and D. Marvick. "Authoritarianism and Political Behavior." Public Opinion Quarterly 17 (1953): 185-201.
- Jennings, M. "Another Look at the Life Cycle and Political Participation." American Journal of Political Science 13 (1979): 755-771.
- Jennings, M. and Markus. "Partisan Orientations Over the Long Haul: Results From the Three Wave Political Socialization Panel Study." American Political Science Review 23 (1984): 755-771.
- Jennings, M. and R. Niemi. Generations and Politics: A Panel Study of Young Adults and Their Parents. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1981.
- Jennings, M. and R. Niemi. "The Persistence of Over-Time Analysis of Two Generations." British Journal of Political Science 8 (1978): 333-363.
- Jennings, M. and R. Niemi. "Continuity and Change in Political Orientations." American Political Science Review 69 (1975): 1316-1335.
- Jirovec, Ronald L. and John Erich. "Dynamics of Political Participation Among the Urban Elderly." Journal of Applied Gerontology 2 2 (Jun 1992): 216-227.
- Kastenbaum, Robert. "Encrusted Elders: Arizona and the Political Spirit of Postmodern Aging." In Voices and Visions of Aging, pp 160-183. Edited by T. Cole et al. New York: Springer Publishing, 1993.
- Kaufman, Sharon. The Ageless Self: Sources of Meaning in Late Life. New York: Meridian, 1986.
- Kausler, D.H. Experimental Psychology, Cognition and Human Aging. 2nd ed. New York: Springer-Verlag, 1991.
- Kavanaugh. Political Science and Political Behaviour. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1983.
- Keith, B. et al. The Myth of the Independent Voter. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992.
- Knutson, J. Handbook of Political Psychology. San Francisco: Jossey Bass, 1973.
- Knutson, J. The Human Basis of the Polity. Chicago: Aldine, 1972.
- Kohut, A. and D. Owen. "Sex Differences in Political Knowledge and Attentiveness." Times Mirror Center for the People and the Press (unpublished), 1995.

- Koller, Marvin R. Social Gerontology. New York: Random House, 1968.
- Kornberg, A. J. Smith and D. Bromley. "Some Differences in the Political Socialization and Patterns of Canadian and American Party Officials." In Socialization to Politics, pp 426-502. Edited by J. Dennis. New York: Wiley, 1973.
- Kuczynski. "Intensity and Orientation of Reasoning." Journal of Experimental Child Psychology 34 (1982): 357-370.
- Kuhn, Maggie. No Stone Unturned: The Life and Times of Maggie Kuhn. New York: Ballentine Books, 1991.
- Kunkel, Suzanne. "An Extra Eight Hours A Day." Generations 13 2 (Spg 89): 57-60.
- Lane, Robert E. Political Life: Why and How People Get Involved in Politics. New York: Free Press, 1959.
- Langton, K.P. and M.K. Jennings. "Political Socialization and the High School Civics Curriculum in the U.S." American Political Science Review 62 (1968): 852-86.
- Laufer, R. "The Aftermath of War: Adult Socialization and Political Development," In Political Learning in Adulthood, pp 415-457. Edited by R. Sigel. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989.
- Lemon, B.W. et al. "An Exploration of the Activity Theory of Aging: Activity Types and Life Satisfaction Among In-Movers to a Retirement Community." Journal of Gerontology 27 (1972): 511-523.
- Levine, R.A. "Culture, Personality and Socialization: An Evolutionary View." In Handbook of Socialization Theory and Research, pp 503-42. Edited by Goslin. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1969.
- Light, Paul. Artful Work: The Politics of Social Security Reform. New York: Random House, 1985.
- Lipman, A. "Minority Aging from the Exchange and Structural-Functionalist Perspectives." In Minority Aging. Edited by R.C. Manuel. Westport, CT: Greenwood, 1982.
- Lipman, A. and Ira Ehrlich. "Psychosocial Theoretical Aspects of Aging" Topics in Geriatric Rehabilitation 1 2 (Jan 1986): 46-57.
- Lipman, A. and K.J. Smith. "Functionality of Disengagement in Old Age." Journal of Gerontology 23 (1968): 517-521.
- Lipset, S.M. Political Man. New York: Doubleday, 1960.
- Litt, E. "Civic Education, Community Norms and Political Indoctrination." American Sociological Review 28 (1963): 69-75.

- Longino, C.F., Jr. and C.S. Kart. "Explicating Activity Theory: A Formal Replication." Journal of Gerontology 37 (1982): 713-722.
- Longman, Philip. "Justice Between Generations." The Atlantic Monthly (June 1985): 73-81.
- Maccoby, H. "Political Activity of Participants in a Voluntary Association." American Sociological Review 23 (1958): 524-532.
- Mackinnon, D.F. and L.R. Squire. "Autobiographical Memory and Amnesia." Psychobiology 17 (1989): 247-256.
- McCormack, P.D. "Autobiographical Memory in the Aged." Canadian Journal of Psychology 33 (1979): 118-124.
- McCrae, R.R. and Paul Costa Jr. Emerging Lives, Enduring Dispositions. Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1984.
- McLeod, J.M. and L.B. Becker. "The Uses and Gratifications Approach." In the Handbook of Political Communication, pp 67-99. Edited by D.D. Nimmo and K.R. Sanders. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, 1981.
- Merelman, Richard, "Revitalizing Political Socialization," In Political Psychology, pp 279-319. Edited by Margaret Herman. San Francisco: Jossey Bass, 1986.
- Merelman, Richard. "Intimate Environments and Political Behavior." Midwest Journal of Political Science 12 (1968):382-400.
- Milbrath, Lester and M.L. Goel. Political Participation. 2nd ed. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1977.
- Milbrath, Lester. Political Participation: How and Why People Get Involved in Politics? Chicago: Rand McNally, 1965.
- Miller, A.H. "Political Issues and Trust in Government: 1964-1970." American Political Science Review 68 (1974): 951-972.
- Miller, A.H., P. Gurin and G. Gurin. "Age Consciousness and Political Mobilization of Older Americans," The Gerontologist 20 6 (Dec 80): 691-700.
- Miller, W.E., D.R. Kinder, S.J. Rosenstone, and the National Election Studies. ANES, 1992: Pre- and Post-Election Survey [CPS Early Release Version] (Computer File). Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research (distributor), 1993.
- Moore, B.S. and N. Eisenberg. "The Development of Altruism." In the Annals of Child Development, pp 107-174. Edited by G. Whitehurst. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press, 1984.

Morgan, W.R., H. Parnes and L. Less. "Leisure Activities and Social Networks." In Retirement Among American Men. Edited by Parnes et al. Lexington MA: D.C. Heath, 1985.

Morris, R. and S. Bass. "A New Class in America: A Revisionist View of Retirement." In Growing Old in America, pp 93-105. Edited by Hess and Markson. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 1991.

Nelson, "Ethnicity and SES as Sources of Participation." American Political Science Review 73 4 (Dec 1979): 1024-1038.

Neugarten, B.L. "Age Groups in American Society and the Rise of the Young-Old." The Annals 415 (1974): 197-98.

Neugarten, B.L. "Adult Personality, Toward a Psychology of the Life Cycle." In Middle Age and Aging: A Reader in Social Psychology. Edited by B.L. Neugarten, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968.

Neugarten, B.L. "Adult Personality: A Developmental View." Human Development 9 (1966): 61-73.

Neugarten, B.L. and Dail A. Neugarten. "Changing Meanings of Age in the Aging Society." In Our Aging Society, pp 33-52. Edited by Fifer and Bronte. New York: Norton, 1986.

Neugarten, B and N. Datan. "Sociological Perspectives on the Life Cycle." In Life-Span Devel Psychology. Edited by P.B. Baltes and K.W. Schaie. New York: Academic Press, 1973.

Newcomb, T. et al. Persistence and Change: Bennington College and its Students After Twenty-Five Years. New York: Wiley, 1967.

Nie, Norman H., Sidney Verba and John R. Petrocik. The Changing American Voter. Cambridge, MA: Harvard, 1979.

Nie, Norman H., Sidney Verba and J. Kim. "Political Participation and the Life Cycle." Comparative Politics 6 (1974): 319-40.

Nimmo, D.D. and K.R. Sanders. Handbook of Political Communication. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, 1981.

Oliner, S.P. and Pearl M. Oliner. The Altruistic Personality. New York: Free Press, 1988.

Olson, Mancur. The Logic of Collective Action. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1965.

Owen, D. and J. Dennis. "Sex Differences in Politicization: The Influence of the Mass Media." Women in Politics 12 4 (1992): 19-41.

Owen, D. and J. Dennis. "Gender Differences in the Politicization of American Children." Women in Politics 8 (1988): 23-43.

- Owen, D. and J. Dennis. "Pre Adult Development of Political Tolerance." Political Psychology 8 (1987): 547-561.
- Pampel, Fred C. and John B. Williamson. Age, Class, Politics, and the Welfare State. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- Parnes, H.S. Work and Retirement. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1981.
- Parrish, Charles J. et al. Political Participation and Aging: Life Span Civic Development. Detroit: Institute of Gerontology, Wayne State, 1985.
- Peppers, L.G. "Patterns of Leisure and Adjustment to Retirement." The Gerontologist 16 (1976): 441-446.
- Peterson, Steven A. Political Behavior. Newbury Pk, CA: Sage, 1990.
- Pierce, N.R. and P.C. Choharis. "Elderly as a Political Force," National Journal 14 37 (Sep 11, 1982): 1559-1562.
- Pifer, A. and L. Bronte. Our Aging Society. New York: Norton, 1986.
- Pinner. "Parental Overprotection and Political Distrust." The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences 361 (1965): 59-70.
- Pratt, H. The Gray Lobby. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1976.
- Putnam, R. "Studying Elite Political Culture: The Case of Ideology." American Political Science Review 65 (1971): 651-681.
- Rabbitt, P.M.A. and L. McInnis. "Do Clever Old People Have Earlier and Richer First Memories?" Psychology and Aging 3 (1988): 338-341.
- Ragan, P.K. and J.J. Dowd. "The Emerging Political Consciousness of the Aged: A Generational Interpretation." Journal of Social Issues 30 (1974): 137-58.
- Renshon, S.A., ed. Handbook of Political Socialization. New York: Free Press, 1977.
- Renshon, S. Psychological Needs and Political Behavior. New York: Free Press, 1974.
- Rice, M.E. and J.E. Grusec. "Saying and Doing." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 32 (1975): 584-593.
- Riley, M.W. and K. Bond, eds. Aging and Society. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1983.
- Riley, M.W. et al. Aging and Society III, A Sociology of Age Stratification. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1972.

Riley, M.W., A. Foner, B. Hess and M.L. Toby. "Socialization for the Middle and Later Years." In Handbook of Socialization Theory and Research. Edited by D.A. Goslin. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1969.

Riley, M.W., and Anne Foner. Aging and Society I, An Inventory of Research Findings. NY: Russell Sage Foundation, 1968.

Rintala, M. "Political Generations." International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, Vol 6, pp 92-96. New York: Free Press, 1968.

Rivas, E. and F. Torres-Gil. "Politics, Diversity, and Minority Aging." Generations 15 4 (Fall-Winter 1991): 47-51.

Roberts, D. et al. "Do the Mass Media Play a Role in Political Socialization?" Australian and New Zealand Journal of Sociology 11 (1975): 37-43.

Rosenbaum, Walter A and James Button. "Is There a Gray Peril? Retirement Politics in Florida." Gerontologist 29 3 (June 1989): 300-306.

Rosenstone, Steven J. and J.M. Hansen. Mobilization, Participation, and Democracy in America. New York: MacMillan, 1993.

Rothman, S. and S.R. Lichter. Roots of Radicalism. New York: Oxford University Press, 1982.

Rubin, D.C., ed. Autobiographical Memories. New York: Cambridge, 1986.

Rushton. "Generosity in Children." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 31 (1975): 459-466.

Rybash, J.M., W.J. Hoyer, and P.A. Roodin. Adult Cognition and Aging. New York: Pergamon Press, 1986.

Sammartino, F.J. "The Effect of Health on Retirement." Social Security Bulletin 50 (1987): 31-52.

Samuelson, R.J. "Benefit Programs for the Elderly--Off Limits to Federal Budget Cutters?" National Journal (Oct 3, 1981): 1757-62.

Schick, and Somit. "The Failure to Teach Political Activity." The American Behavioral Scientist 6 (Jan, 1963): 5-8.

Schultz, J. The Economics of Aging. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1985.

Schwartz, David C. Political Alienation and Political Behavior. Chicago: Aldine, 1973.

Searing, D., Wright G. and G. Rabinowitz. "The Primacy Principle: Attitude Change and Political Socialization." British Journal of Political Science 16 (1975):155-184.

- Searing, D., Schwartz, J.J. and A.E. Lind. "The Structuring Principle: Political Socialization and Belief Systems," American Political Science Review 67 (1973): 415-432.
- Sears, D.O. Political Attitudes Through the Life Cycle. San Francisco: Freeman, 1982.
- Sears, D.O. "Political Behavior." In The Handbook of Social Psychology. Edited by G. Lindzey and E. Aronson. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1969.
- Sears, D.O. and R. Lane. Public Opinion. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1964.
- Sheinkopf, K. "Family Communication Patterns and Anticipatory Socialization." Journalism Quarterly 50 (1973): 24-30.
- Shively, W.P. "Development of Party Identification Among Adults." American Political Science Review 73 4 (Dec 1979): 1039-1054.
- Siegel and Taeuber. "Demographic Dimensions." In Our Aging Society. Edited by Pifer and Bronte. New York: Norton, 1986.
- Sigel, R.S. Learning About Politics. NY: Random House, 1970.
- Sigel, Roberta S., ed. Political Learning in Adulthood, A Sourcebook of Theory and Research. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989.
- Sigelman, L. et al. "Voting and Non Voting: A Multi-Election Perspective." American Journal of Political Science 29 (Nov 85): 749-765.
- Sperbeck, D.J., S.K. Whitbourne, and W.J. Hoyer. "Age and Openness to Experience in Autobiographical Memory." Experimental Aging Research 12 (1986): 169-172.
- Staub, Ervin. Positive Social Behavior and Morality. New York: Academic Press, 1979.
- Steckenrider, Janie S. and Neal E. Cutler. "Aging and Adult Political Socialization." In Political Learning in Adulthood, pp 56-88. Edited by R. Sigel. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989.
- Stephens, N. and B. Merrill. "Targeting the Over 65 Vote in Political Campaigns." Journal of Advertising 13 3 (1984): 17-20.
- Strate, J. et al. "Life Span Civic Development and Voting Participation," American Political Science Review 83 2 (June 1989): 443-464.
- Suzman, Richard M., David Willis, and Kenneth Manton. The Oldest Old. New York: Oxford University Press, 1992.

- Tims, Albert R. "Family Political Communication and Social Values," Communication Research 13 (1986): 5-17.
- Torres-Gil, Fernando M. The New Aging New York: Auburn House, 1992.
- Torres-Gil, Fernando M. Politics of Aging Among Elder Hispanics. Dissertation, University of Southern California, 1976.
- Trela, J.E. "Age Structure of Voluntary Associations and Political Self-Interest among the Aged." Sociological Quarterly 13 (1972): 244-52.
- Trela, J.E. "Some Political Consequences of Senior Centers and other Old Age Group Memberships." Gerontologist 11 (1971): 118-123.
- Truman, David. The Governmental Process. New York: Knopf, 1951.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census. Current Population Reports. Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1992.
- U.S. Senate. Aging America: Trends and Projections. Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1988.
- Verba, S. and N.H. Nie. Participation in America. New York: Harper and Row, 1972.
- Wagar, Linda. "Saying No to Grandma." State Government News 32 3 (1989): 10-14.
- Wallace, S.P. et al. "Lamb in Wolf's Clothing? The Reality of Senior Power and Social Policy." In Critical Perspectives on Aging. Edited by M. Minkler. Amityville, NY: Baywood Publishing, 1991.
- Whitbourne, S. The Aging Body. New York: Springer-Verlag, 1985.
- Whiting, B. and J. Whiting. Children of Six Cultures. Cambridge: MA: Harvard University Press, 1975.
- Wolfinger, R. and S.J. Rosenstone. Who Votes? New Haven: Yale University Press, 1980.
- Woodruff, D.S. and J.E. Birren, eds. Aging: Scientific Perspectives and Social Issues. 2nd ed. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole, 1983.
- Zahn-Waxler, C. et al. "Child Rearing and Children's Prosocial Imitations Toward Victims of Distress." Child Development 50 (1979): 319-330.
- Zinsser, John. "Gray Panthers: Fighting the Good Fight for 15 Years." 50 Plus 26 3 (Mar 1986): 12-13.